

---

This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google<sup>™</sup> books

<http://books.google.com>







600107799\$







# THE KISS OF PEACE.



The Kiss of Peace:  
OR,  
ENGLAND AND ROME  
AT ONE  
ON THE DOCTRINE  
OF  
THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

An Essay, in Two Parts.

BY  
A FELLOW OF \* \* \* COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.



LONDON:  
J. T. HAYES, LYALL PLACE, EATON SQUARE.  
1867.

110 k 228.





TO  
JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, D.D.,  
OF THE ROMAN COMMUNION,  
AND  
EDWARD BOUVERIE PUSEY, D.D.,  
OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION,  
THROUGH WHOSE INSTRUMENTALITY, MORE THAN THAT OF ANY  
OTHER LIVING MEN,

## *The Holy Ghost*

WOULD SEEM AT THIS DAY TO BE CARRYING ON THE GREAT  
WORK OF  
CORPORATE RE-UNION,  
THIS HUMBLE EFFORT TO BREAK DOWN ONE OF THE  
BARRIERS OF SEPARATION BETWEEN US  
IS DEDICATED,  
WITHOUT THEIR PERMISSION,  
BY ONE PERSONALLY UNKNOWN TO THEM,  
IN TOKEN OF  
SINCERE ADMIRATION OF THEIR WORK,  
AND OF  
DEEP GRATITUDE TO GOD,  
FROM WHOM ALL SUCH WORKS DO PROCEED.



## ANALYTICAL CONTENTS.

---

[For the following careful Summary and Analysis the writer of this Essay is indebted to the kindness of a friend, to whom he desires here to render his public acknowledgments.]

---

### PART I.

	Page
SECTION I.	
Three Eucharistic Theories current in the English Church .....	1
<i>a.</i> Consecration only a setting apart for a holy use—Symbolism .....	ib.
<i>b.</i> Consecration confers a Potential Presence—the Theory of Reception .....	2
Subdivided into	
<i>a.</i> Virtualism—the benefit or virtue of Christ's Body and Blood alone received .....	5
<i>β.</i> Realism—the Body and Blood <i>really</i> received .....	ib.
<i>c.</i> Consecration effectuates the Real Objective Presence of Christ .....	ib.

	Page
Distinction stated between the last and the two former opinions . . . . .	6
Explanation of the word Objective . . . . .	ib.
Realism implies only a <i>subjective</i> Presence . . . . .	7
The doctrine of the Real Objective Presence declares against—	
1. The Symbolist that there <i>is</i> a Presence.	
2. The Virtualist that it is a <i>real</i> Presence.	
3. The Realist that it is an <i>objective</i> not a <i>subjective</i> Presence . . . . .	9
 SECTION II.	
What does the Church of England say herself? . . . .	10
Symbolist and Catholic have here no common ground of argument . . . . .	ib.
Fallacy of Private Judgment . . . . .	11
Article XX. quoted . . . . .	12
Illustration from use of Athanasian Creed . . . . .	13
<i>Objection</i> —It is only private judgment that determines what the Church of England teaches on the question . . . . .	ib.
<i>Reply</i> —Catechism of 1604 is the Church's voice speaking authoritatively . . . . .	14
Catechism says that neither the Symbolist nor Virtualist nor Realist fully states the Church's doctrine.	
1. To the Symbolist it says—	
“The <i>Body and Blood of Christ</i> are” [in some sense] “received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper,” and not mere Bread and Wine . . . . .	16

	Page
2. To the Virtualist—	
“ <i>The Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed, &amp;c.</i> ” not merely in effect and virtue.....	17
<i>Objections</i> from words of Article XXVIII.	ib.
„ „ Post Communion	ib.
3. To the Realist—	
“ <i>The Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received,</i> ” &c....	19
Meaning of the word faithful.....	20
Words of Article XXVIII., “ <i>given, taken, and eaten</i> ” .....	21
“Give” and “take” necessarily imply the objective character of the Presence .....	ib.
Statement of the Church’s doctrine—	
1. Communion was not the primary object of the Institution .....	22
Two Errors current—	
a. Of Theory—confining the Presence to the act of reception.....	23
β. Of Practice—in neglect of non-communicating attendance .....	ib.
Rubrics must be read by dogmatic light of the Catechism .....	ib.
2. Eucharist treated of under three heads—	
a. <i>Signum Sacramenti</i> or <i>Sacramentum</i> = “outward sign ordained by Christ Himself” .....	ib.
β. <i>Res Sacramenti</i> = “thing signified”	24
γ. <i>Virtus Sacramenti</i> = “benefit or effect of receiving the same”....	ib.

	Page
The word Sacrament is sometimes used <i>not</i> in its strict sense .....	24
The wicked receive the <i>Res</i> , not the <i>Virtus Sacramenti</i>	25
Illustration from light and vision .....	26
 <b>SECTION III.</b>	
The Eucharistic Sacrifice .....	30
The continual remembrance=memorial Sacrifice..	ib.
Significance of <i>παράκλησις</i> .....	31
Objection from Article XXXI.—the Sacrifices of Masses .....	33
Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.....	ib.
Omission of the word Altar in Prayer-Book .....	ib.
Reply .....	34
Title <i>Cæna Domini</i> used equally by Rome and England .....	39
Difficulties are real and logical, not merely ques- tions of externals .....	40
Each party holds some portion of truth .....	41
True Symbolism .....	42
Catholic Ritual no chance form .....	ib.
True Virtualism .....	44
The true use of the Real Presence .....	45
Superiority of <i>Worship</i> to <i>Prayer</i> .....	46
The Presence anterior to Communion—therefore the Holy Eucharist the great act of Worship and Adoration.....	47
Summary of the Argument .....	49

## PART II.

	Page
<b>PROPOSITION.</b>	
Rome and England do not use the word <i>Transubstantiation</i> in the same sense .....	54
Doctrine of Real Objective Presence <i>does</i> involve Transubstantiation .....	ib.
<b>SECTION I.</b>	
By <i>Transubstantiation</i> English Church means <i>Transaccidentation</i> .....	55
Explanation of word Accidents .....	ib.
"          "          Substance.....	56
Illustration—Same substance in corn, flour, and bread, while accidents are changed .....	57
The Latin word <i>substantia</i> has only this definite meaning, and does not include the loose meanings given to the English word substance .....	58
Explanation of word <i>Transubstantiation</i> in Roman use .....	59
Reason necessitates belief in Transubstantiation as a corollary from the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence .....	60
Faith and Reason .....	ib.
Before Consecration the Elements were things ( <i>res</i> ) ; after, they are only forms ( <i>signa</i> ).....	61
This shewn by language of Catechism .....	62
Primary law of thought that a thing cannot be substantially two things at once .....	63
Hence, if there is a change, that change must be Transubstantiation .....	ib.



	Page
Roman statement simply affirms this law, and does not over-define.....	64
Necessary Corollary from our Lord's own Words ..	65
Decree of Council of Trent quoted .....	66
Bishop Andrewes's misconception of the Roman statement .....	67
Rome repudiates the possibility of "expressing the <i>mode</i> of the Presence in words" .....	68
Necessity and Meaning of the word <i>whole</i> in the Tridentine Decree .....	70
Tridentine definition at once a touchstone of erroneous belief and a shield against scepticism ....	72
<b>SECTION II.</b>	
<i>Objections</i> —1. Does not Rome mean by <i>substantially</i> something more than has hitherto been stated?.....	73
Do not the words <i>vere et realiter</i> correspond with the English "verily and indeed," &c. ? Is not <i>substantialiter</i> an addition expressing something more than the English doctrine of the Real Objective Presence ? .....	74
<b>REPLY.</b>	
All decrees of Councils lay down not only what is to be believed, but what is <i>not</i> to be believed....	ib.
<i>Substantialiter</i> is opposed to <i>virtualiter</i> .....	ib.
English word "verily" opposes the two errors—	
1. That the consecrated elements are only <i>signa</i> .	
2. That Christ is only present <i>in figura</i> .....	75
<i>Vere</i> is opposed to (1), <i>realiter</i> to (2) .....	ib.
The word "indeed" opposes Virtualism, and is equivalent to <i>substantialiter</i> .....	76

	Page
II. Is it impossible to conceive the co-existence of two substances ?	
Mr. Stuart quoted in support of this objection . . . .	76
He parallels the hypostatic union with the co-existence of "Bread and our Lord's Body" . . . . .	77
<i>Reply</i> —Mr. Stuart unconsciously misrepresents the Roman definition . . . . .	78
Hypostatic union not parallel. <i>Person</i> there equivalent to <i>substance</i> in inanimate nature . . . . .	ib.
Mr. Mackonochie's "Pastoral" quoted . . . . .	80
Here again confusion of language in speaking of "natural material substances." Substance is supernatural . . . . .	81
<i>Digression.</i>	
The hidden sacramentality of nature . . . . .	82
The Catholic doctrine enables us to look behind the accidents to the substance, from the natural to the supernatural . . . . .	83
The denial of the Real Objective Presence results often from a materialistic clinging to sense . .	85
The miracle of the Altar the greatest of all miracles . . . . .	86
Parallel between Judaic objections (S. John vi.) and modern unbelief . . . . .	87
The phrase "natural material substances" must be equivalent to accidents, or it is a contradiction in terms . . . . .	88
Strict language ought to be used on this subject . .	89
A change must be made either in the accidents or in the substance; it certainly is not in the former, therefore it must be in the latter . . . . .	ib.

	Page
SECTION III.	
Case put of a youth instructed in the Real Objective Presence. He answers to the question, "What is this?" "It is the Body of Christ" .....	90
The formula of Transubstantiation merely puts into the <i>mouths</i> of the faithful what they have already conceived in their minds .....	91
<i>Objection</i> —The English Church protests against a natural Presence, and it is generally believed that Rome holds a carnal Presence, and on that account withholds the cup from her laity .....	92
<i>Reply</i> —Explanation of spiritual as opposed to natural.	94
Spiritual <i>not</i> used in a subjective sense in connection with the Eucharist .....	95
The meaning of spiritual in the English Liturgy and Articles cannot be such as would be contradictory of the Catechism .....	ib.
Spiritual has a real <i>objective</i> meaning equivalent to supernatural .....	97
No Symbolist would have drawn the article when thus explained .....	98
Propositions—	
1. The Roman formula maintains the Real Objective Presence to be a spiritual and heavenly Presence .....	100
2. She does not believe it to be a natural and earthly Presence .....	ib.
Proof—Con. Trid., Sess. XIII., c. 1. ....	ib.

# CONTENTS.

XV

	Page
3. Rome does not hold Transaccidentation.	
Proof—Reasons assigned for Communion in one kind .....	106
Summary of foregoing points .....	107

## SECTION IV.

The Church of England rejects not Transubstantiation, but Transaccidentation.....	109
The Declaration on kneeling—supposed difficulties in .....	110
“Very natural <i>substances</i> ” mean really “very natural <i>properties</i> ,” <i>i. e.</i> accidents, and Transubstantiation means Transaccidentation .....	111
No epithets can be applied to substance .....	ib.
Argument from word “bodily” .....	112
Mr. Carter quoted to shew loose popular use of substance as equivalent to properties .....	115
Supposed difficulties in Art. XXVIII. ....	116
No one would have drawn such a statement to oppose the Tridentine formula .....	ib.
Mr. Carter again quoted .....	118
Bishop Forbes quoted as implying that Rome holds removal of the <i>munus temporale</i> .....	119
Reply to this misconception .....	120
Article really protests against a <i>carнал</i> Presence ..	121
The Article affirms — “Transubstantiation overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament,” &c.; but the Roman formula does not do so, though Transaccidentation does .....	122

	Page
Nature of Christ's Presence and nature of change in the Elements are strictly correlative ideas . . . . .	124
The Roman Church had the task of strengthening faith; the English of defending it against super- stitious corruptions. The work of the one was <i>positive</i> , that of the other <i>negative</i> . . . . .	126
Hence the two co-ordinate propositions.	
(1.) While Rome says—	
" In whatever sense the Bread becomes Christ's Body in <i>that</i> sense it ceases to be Bread " ..	130
(2.) England says—	
" In whatever sense it remains Bread, it does not in <i>that</i> sense becomes Christ's Body " ..	ib.
Conclusion—	
Little danger now of men believing in <i>carnal</i> or natural Presence . . . . .	132
Desirable to relinquish the English Protestations	133
Practical suggestions . . . . .	134
Recent utterances of English Dignitaries . . . . .	135
Appeal for Unity . . . . .	137
POSTSCRIPT—	
Examination of a Letter to the <i>Guardian</i> from the Rev. Reginald Smith . . . . .	140
The Editor believes Roman Transubstantiation to be a carnal Presence . . . . .	147
Two general answers—	
I. The Marian persecution political, not doc- trinal; and the doctrines of the Martyrs identical with those of the Council of Trent	148

## CONTENTS.

xvii

	Page
II. The senses are not deceived in Transsubstantiation, and an appeal to sense as sole arbiter unwarranted in matters divine ....	150

## APPENDIX.

Note A.—Examination of objections to use of Aristotelian terminology.....	155
Note B.—Further criticism of the supposed parallel of the Hypostatic Union .....	160
Note C.—Examination of the popular objections against the Roman use of Communion in one kind.....	166



## INTRODUCTION.

---

“ Pax hominibus bonæ voluntatis.”

---

To a reverent mind an attempt to deal with this Mystery of our Faith can never be anything but a painful and unwelcome task, only to be undertaken with the greatest reluctance. Nothing but a sincere desire to defend truth where attacked, or to explain it where misunderstood, could ever justify such an attempt to the mind of the writer. We, who are taught by our Church, as we believe, to hold in faith the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence in the Holy Eucharist, are content to do so from a simple, childlike acceptance of the plain words of Scripture, as given to us by the Church. We believe, as the Council of Trent says, “ that the *manner* of that Presence cannot be expressed in words ; but that the *possibility* of it, as an *act of God*, can be conceived, and ought to be constantly maintained.” As, however, there are at the present day several opinions abroad on this subject, which seriously hinder the extension of Christ’s



kingdom on earth, the writer has felt constrained for the love of Christ, and of his brethren in Christ, to make this attempt to meet them.

It is a common belief among a large majority of the members of our Church, that she does not hold the doctrine of the "Real Objective Presence." And this belief is unfortunately strengthened by the materialistic tendencies of the present day, which regard nothing as "real" which cannot be apprehended by "sense," or as "objective" which does not perceptibly conform to those laws of Extension and Visibility which we *see* or *feel* to be in operation around us.

Another equally or perhaps more widely prevalent belief is, that the "Church of England," when she *rejects* the doctrine of "Transubstantiation," uses the word in the *same* sense in which the "Church of Rome" uses it when she *accepts* it.

In neither of these two prevalent beliefs can the writer concur; and it is in the hope that others also may be brought to deem them erroneous, that he ventures to bring the following pages under their notice.

May the Spirit of Truth and Love be with him who writes and with him who reads!

## PART I.

---

# THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

AND

## THE DOCTRINE OF THE REAL OBJECTIVE PRESENCE.

---

THERE are, in general, three forms of belief at present current in the Church of England, relative to that which all allow to be the greatest ordinance of our religion.

I.—One is, that the consecration simply implies a setting apart for a holy use certain elements of Bread and Wine by a Minister authorised, in point of order, to do so: that this holy use is, the partaking of them by those whose hearts are full of the love of Christ, in remembrance of His death, and of the unspeakable benefits it procured for them;—that the Bread and Wine, thus set apart, are symbols of the precious Body which was broken, and of the precious Blood which was shed;—and that the

47  
B

participation of them is, on the one hand, a sign of the fellowship of love binding all true hearts together; and, on the other, a sign of the nourishment and growth of the soul, as fed by Christ Himself. A beautiful faith; most touching in its simplicity, and most winning in its fervency when sincerely held. May we ever gladly recognise in it its beauty, its simplicity, its fervour, even when sorrowfully compelled to deny its truth. Many of us, perhaps, did think it true once. Let us not forget this; but let us hold our present truth in love.

As we shall often have to refer to this belief again, we must, for pure convenience sake, give it a name. Let us call it "Symbolism"—it is no dishonourable name—and its professors "Symbolists."

II.—The second opinion is one which is held in various degrees of clearness and comprehensiveness; but it will, perhaps, be best merely to state it in its fullest form. It is this: that the elements of Bread and Wine, when consecrated by a properly ordained Priest, are, by the operation of the Holy Ghost acting at the time he recites certain words and performs certain actions, in such a sense changed that they become the channels through which the Body and Blood of Christ are subsequently conveyed

to those *who receive them with certain dispositions of mind*. The Presence of Christ in the elements after consecration is, in this case, merely *potential*, not *actual*; that is, the elements have simply received the *power of receiving*—or, more commonly, the power of *conveying*—that Presence, and have not yet received the Presence itself. The *actual* Presence does not take place till an *act of reception* on the part of a properly qualified receiver. In other words, the elements after consecration do not become the Body and Blood of Christ, but are so changed that, whereas, when standing on the Holy Table before consecration, they were plain Bread and Wine, and, if partaken of, would be capable of no other effects than any other Bread and Wine, *now*, if partaken of by a properly qualified receiver, they become the Body and Blood of Christ, *in* and *by virtue of* the *act of participation*. The Presence, therefore, depends not on the consecration, but on the participation,—on the act, not of the Priest, but of the communicant.

Here we evidently have, what we had not in the last case, a sacramental theory—*i.e.* the “outward signs” have become not merely a memorial or a figure of, but a definite medium for the conveyance of, an “inward grace.” This view has not that beauty of simplicity which

characterised the first opinion ; it has not that charm of a holy fervour brooking no medium whatever between the soul that loves and the object of its love ; it has, however, for the obedient servant of Christ and of His Church, who believes in such a system of mediation, because, as the Church tells him, Christ has Himself ordained such—for him, I say, it has the attraction of truth ; truth, that is, so far as it recognises, in a certain sense, that great fact of sacramentary mediation—

“ By which the whole round world is every way  
Bound with gold chains about the feet of God.”

We must also, purely for the sake of reference, give this opinion a name. Let us call it the “Theory of Reception,” and its professors “Receptionists.” Do not be frightened, gentle reader, at this uncouth title. We shall but seldom use it : for the Receptionist must divide himself again into two classes ; and it will be under one or the other of these latter that we shall have mostly to refer to him.

This division turns upon the question—“In what sense is Christ present in the act of participation ?” “What does the Receptionist in his ‘reception’ receive ?” “Does the duly qualified receiver really receive *Christ*—does he in a supernatural, or (as the Council

of Trent says) in a sacramental and ineffable manner, receive *Him personally*, or merely a certain *virtue* of Him—*i. e.* certain powers, gifts, graces, &c., which He alone can bestow, and which He has specially promised to give through the medium of the consecrated Bread and Wine?" "Is Christ, in fact, really or merely virtually received?"

According to the answer the Receptionist gives to this question, must we, purely for convenience sake, call him a "Realist"\* or a "Virtualist," and his belief "Realism" or "Virtualism."

III.—The third opinion, which maintains what is commonly called the "Real Objective Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist," differs from "Virtualism," and agrees with "Realism," inasmuch as it maintains that Christ Himself is personally received in the act of participation, and not any mere virtue of Christ. It differs, however, from both, in that it maintains that the elements of Bread and Wine, when consecrated by a properly ordained Priest, are, by the operation of the Holy Ghost acting at the time he recites

---

\* Of course, no allusion is intended here to the old controversy between "Realists" and "Nominalists."

certain words and performs certain actions, in such sense changed, that they become, *not* the channels through which Christ *will* be conveyed to those who properly receive Him, but *then* and *there* Christ Himself, whether received or not. According to this belief, the elements at the time of consecration become “actually” and not merely “potentially” Christ; and the Presence, therefore, depends on the act of consecration, not of participation; on the act, that is, of the Priest, not of the communicant.

The two points of distinction between this third opinion and the two forms of the second opinion are well brought out by the two words “Real” and “Objective.”

The Presence is “real,” not “virtual,”—the Presence is Christ Himself, and not merely the power or virtue of Christ. In this word “real,” therefore, we proclaim our distinction from the Virtualist, and our identity with the Realist.

In the word “Objective,” however, we proclaim our divergence from both.

Let me explain this term. It is derived from the primary, natural, irresistible distinction which every child draws between itself and the whole world of persons and things around it. “I myself am myself,”—so says the child in effect,—“and everything else is not myself, but

something outside and beyond myself. Everything else is an '*object*' brought into relation with me through a series of impressions of which I am the '*subject*.'" This is a simple case of the primary application of these words, though the further applications of them are more or less various and complicated. Happily this primary application of them is quite sufficient for our present purpose; for it shows that we use the words rightly when we speak of an "Objective" Presence—as of a *fact* existing by itself in the world of "objects" *without us*—in contradistinction to a "Subjective" Presence, the existence of which depends upon certain modes and dispositions of personal thought and *feeling within us*,—within the "subject," that is, who performs the act of reception.

And it is clear, too, that this is a distinction of great practical importance. For a "subjective" Presence is really, when thoroughly examined, no Presence at all. For who is to know if there be any Presence in this sense? I would ask any "Realist" Priest: "Have you any certain warrant for believing, when you administer the Sacrament to ten communicants, that any one of those ten has that kind and amount of 'subjective' qualification for reception which would, as you believe, produce that Presence, in and by his act of reception?"



You will reply : “ I *hope* I have ; I charitably *trust* I have.”

I ask any communicant : “ Are you sure that, at the time of your last Communion, your repentance and faith were such as to justify you in saying positively that you received Christ ?”

You will answer : “ I *hope* they were ; I *trust* they were.”

But “ hope ” and “ trust,” my gentle reader, I know you will agree with me, are not *certainty*. They can never amount to that state of *positive assurance* with which we are wont to assert the plain existence of an “ objective ” fact. And, therefore, we must admit that a “ Subjective ” Presence, such as is implied by making it dependent upon the qualifications of the recipient, may indeed be a Presence, but is not necessarily a Presence at all. At the close of no single celebration of the Lord’s Supper could a mere Realist assert that “ Christ had been sacramentally present there.” He can say : “ I hope, I trust, I have good reason to suppose, He was there,” but he could never say “ He *was* there.” And therefore it is important to mark this word “ objective,” which distinguishes us from the Realist, just as the word “ real ” distinguishes us from the Virtualist. The Realist believes in a “ Real Presence ”—thus far he is one with us, and differs from

the Virtualist; but his "Real Presence" is a "Real *Subjective* Presence," which, as I have shewn, can never be positively asserted to be a Presence at all; and therefore we call ours a "Real *Objective* Presence," in order to mark this distinction.

We have thus passed, step by step, from the "Memorial Feast of Love," to a "*Virtual* Presence of Christ in the act of due reception;" and from a 'Virtual Presence' to a "'*Real*' Presence of Christ in the act of due reception," and we have finally arrived at a "Real Presence of Christ in the *consecrated elements themselves*."

Now, be it observed, nothing is here said of the *nature* of that Presence, or of the *nature of the change* in the elements at the time when this Presence takes possession of them. We have simply now declared—

1. As against the Symbolist, that there *is* a Presence.

2. As against the Virtualist, that it is a *Real* Presence; and

3. As against the Realist, that this Real Presence is *Objective* and not *Subjective*—that it is an *independent* fact in the world without us, and not something which is *dependent* on the presence of peculiar feelings and dispositions within us.

Here then let us pause: let us enter into no further questions. Let us simply ask ourselves: "Which of these three opinions now current among the members of the Church of England is the opinion of the Church herself?" For surely on that which all three classes admit to be the central ordinance of Christianity, the Church must *have* an opinion, and *only one*.

With the Symbolist, I am afraid, our intercourse will here cease. I am not aware that he has ever seriously attempted to prove his view of the Sacrament from the *Prayer-Book*; nor would he listen to me, if I attempted to prove from it that his view was not the view of our Church. It would be sufficient for him to feel, as he honestly does feel, that his view of it is the Scriptural view; for he does not recognise the Church as the Exponent of Scripture. Between him and me there is fixed—in this, as in all questions touching the eternal interests of man—the wide impassable gulf of "private judgment;" and however much I may long to reach him, and tempt him to taste those draughts of Sacramental truth,—the sweetness of which none but those who have tasted them can know,—I cannot even stretch out a hand to help him. No! he and I must stand on the *same* side of the gulf before we can converse together. Yet before parting from him will I say:—

There were once two men, whose memory you hold dear, Luther and Zwinglius. Both, as you do, appealed to Holy Scripture as their sole guide and authority. Both, as you do, believed they read Holy Scripture by the light of the Holy Spirit for which they prayed. Each, however, took an opposite view of the very words with which this sacred ordinance was instituted; and the strife was so sore, that they and their followers—ardently as they longed for union—parted for ever.

Now, let me ask you,—“Which of these two men had the light of God’s Holy Spirit?” For it cannot be that the Holy Spirit speaking through them both, about that which you acknowledge to be the most sacred ordinance of our religion, gave two diametrically opposite interpretations of these simple words. “Which, then, was His mouthpiece?” And if you say Zwinglius, I will ask once more, “What right have you to say that Zwinglius was His mouthpiece and Luther not?” And whilst you are thinking of your answer to this question, let me, only once, waive my allegiance to the Church, and meet you on your own ground, by quoting Scripture to you.

“No prophecy\* of the Scripture is of any private interpretation.”

---

\* “Prophecy,” *i.e.* utterance. See the context of the preceding verse.

And let me ask you to *whom* it was our Lord was speaking, when He said :

“When He the Spirit of Truth is come, He will guide you into all truth ?”

And also *who* they were of whom we read in the second chapter of the Acts :

“And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost.”

I would also ask, did S. Peter sanction, or not, an appeal to private judgment, when he wrote those awful words :

“In which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, unto their own destruction.”

I have, for the moment, crossed the gulf to you, and quoted Scripture ; can you not, for the moment, cross the gulf to me, and hear the voice of the Church ?

“The Church hath authority in controversies of faith.”

I see you stop your ears, and turn your head away. I do not, however, give up all hopes yet ; for I will further ask you :—

Do you never cross the gulf ? Do you always remain on the other side ? Do *you* never appeal to the “Church as your authority in controversies of faith ?” If, for instance, one of your flock comes to you with Unitarian difficulties,—

do you never,—I will not say quote the Athanasian Creed,—but *apply Scripture by the light of it*? Did you, I will ask, personally, by pure force of prayerful study, and from the bare text of Scripture itself, without any lingering recollections of the creed you learnt at your mother's knee, find out the full and true doctrine of the Holy and Undivided Trinity? If so, then is the gulf indeed impassable between us. If not,—if you have crossed it once,—then, I implore you, by all your love of truth, of honesty, and of your Church, cross it once more, and bear with me a little longer, whilst I endeavour to ascertain what our Church really does say on this most momentous question.

But here, I fancy, the Virtualist will stop me, and say:—"I am afraid you and I will get on no better together than you and the Symbolist. Here, again, there will be an 'impassable gulf of private judgment' between us. I admit your appeal to the Church to decide what Scripture says; but who is to decide what the Church herself says? For I shall say she says one thing, and you will probably say she says another; and if, to prevent personalities, we ask others, her most learned divines, to tell us what she does say, we shall be just as far off coming to an agreement as we were before; for if you

quote me Andrewes, I shall quote you Hooker, and who then is to decide between us ?”

“My friend,” I shall reply, “do not be in too great a hurry. No doubt you were standing by and thinking how nicely what I had said to the Symbolist about the ‘private interpretation of Scripture,’ could be applied in your turn to the ‘private interpretation of the Church ;’ and you chuckled good-humouredly, like a genial, hearty, honest old English dean as I fancy you are, to think in what a pretty trap you would catch me. But stay, for you have not got me fast yet. I will, for the moment, grant you that the Articles and the Liturgy of our Church contain expressions to which you may attach one meaning and I another. But is there still nobody to decide between us ? Is there no further court of appeal ? *Has the Church never been her own interpreter ?*

“Now, supposing you and I had been living before the year 1604, then we might have found ourselves in the predicament in which you so maliciously hoped to catch me. But fortunately for me, and unfortunately for you, Mr. Dean, in that year the Church put forward a certain form of instruction for all her members on the most important subjects of their faith ; and she has thus given us a Court of Final Appeal, in which to settle our differences, and a standard of interpre-

tation by which to correct all private renderings of the expressions she uses elsewhere. Here, in the last part of the Church Catechism, we have the Church sitting in judgment upon her own (then existing) formulæ ; and any such interpretation, therefore, of these, as brings them into open conflict with her own judicial decision thereon, you will, I am sure, admit to be erroneous and untenable. True, a few alterations were introduced in the Rubrics of the Liturgy in 1662, and therefore on these amendments we do not at present possess any final voice of interpretation. I have, however, no fear of any man, be he Symbolist, Virtualist, or Realist, quoting *these* in his defence. We may, then, at once refer our differences to the arbitration of the Church Catechism. Of course, if even here you find room for an interpretation of your own different to mine, we must then, both of us, further appeal to the Church in Convocation. I am, however, sanguine enough to think that you will agree with me that the Church here speaks in language which can bear only one meaning, and that, therefore, all further appeal is unnecessary."

Come, then, my friends, say I,—all three of you, if you will,—for I hope the Symbolist has, after all, come along with us, if only to see who gets the best of the fight ; and let us submit



our disputes to this court of arbitration. Let us see whether the Church bids us teach the young lambs of her flock, Symbolism, Virtualism, Realism, or the "Real Objective Presence." I am afraid you will think me very rude, for I am going to be most unceremoniously short with you, and make the Church give judgment before she hears what you each have to say in your defence.

What then says the Church in her Catechism to the Symbolist ?

She says :—You have rightly understood me when you say that I have bidden you to God's Board, there to partake of Bread and Wine, "in remembrance of Christ's death, and of the benefits you receive thereby," and that in a spirit of repentance and faith, and of love to God and to all men. I pray God that all my children may have such thankful hearts and such loving faith as yours. You have not, however, *fully* understood what I meant by this "remembrance;" and, moreover, as the Virtualist has long been telling you, so I tell you, that "the *Body and Blood of Christ* are" (in some sense) "received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper" and not, as you think, mere Bread and Wine.

She will then turn to the Virtualist and say :—All that you hold in common with the Symbolist, you hold in accordance with my teaching; and

you are right, too, in that which you hold *in addition* to Symbolism. But you have not *fully* understood me. The Realist has long ago assured you that it is not “virtually,” but “really,”—not in mere “effects,” but in His “Person,” that Christ is received in the Sacrament. And he has told you right. Only listen to my words in my last formal statement on the subject. They are these:—“The Body and Blood of Christ are *verily* and *indeed* received” in the Sacrament. How can you, therefore, expect me to award a verdict in your favour? You surely could never have thought that “*verily* and *indeed*” meant “in virtue and effect.” No! you took some other formula of mine,—perhaps my Twenty-eighth Article, in which I had told you that the “Body of Christ is . . . eaten in the supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner;”—or, perhaps, the Post-Communion Thanksgiving, in which I speak of the “spiritual food of the most precious Body. . . .” You then applied to the word “spiritual” a modern meaning, at variance with that in which I used it three hundred years ago, and on this meaning of the word you built up your airy fabric of Virtualism. And as for my other formularies:—“Oh! dear,” you said, “two are enough for me: here are the two witnesses, out of the mouth of which every word can be established.”

“Besides,” you continued, “only see how my Virtualism cuts at the root of the ‘Romish doctrine’ of a ‘natural Presence:’ this *must* have been what the Church meant.” And so in your easy, good-tempered, *laissez-aller*, undogmatic way, you flattered yourself you had fathomed my real meaning. Do not, however, think I wish to be harsh with you. You probably noticed how strongly I insisted upon the greatness of the gift to be obtained by a worthy reception,—“the strengthening and refreshing of the soul.” This led you to suppose that I regarded the Presence as the presence of the operation and effects of Christ upon the soul, and not a Presence of Christ Himself. I thank you sincerely for thus holding up before my children the joy and crown of all the stores of sacramental grace I have, as their mother in Christ, provided for them. I praise your intention, though I am sorry it led you into error. But I only tell you the truth when I say that your opponent the Realist, who says that Christ is “verily and indeed” received, is right, and you are wrong. You have heard my judgment as between him and you; I must now decide between him and *his* opponent.

And what will she say to the Realist? She will say:—

You are right in your Symbolism, and right

too, in that wherein the Virtualist differed from the Symbolist. Equally right are you, too, in saying, in contradistinction to the Virtualist, that there is a "Real" Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament. Even you, however, have not *fully* apprehended my meaning, for you have limited that presence, "real," as you rightly believe it to be, to the act of reception. You have probably observed how strongly I insist upon my children recognising the value of a *participation* in the sacramental food. Three hundred years ago there had been evil days. There was little faith, little knowledge, little love in the land. Communion was but seldom made, and when made they were often judgments instead of blessings, because there was no due preparation for them. Accordingly, I determined to be stricter in my laws, and more emphatic in my warnings. I held none to be members of my communion who did not communicate at least three times every year. I told them plainly that they cut themselves off from the Body of Christ unless they did this. I wanted my children to return to the primitive practice of communicating every Lord's Day and festival; and therefore I inwove in my Liturgy a larger amount of devotions for actual Communion than were in it before. And to prevent the terrible sin of unworthy Communion, I spoke

strongly and repeatedly on the *qualifications* for a due *reception*, and of the priceless benefits to be obtained thereby. You were misled, I see, by all this into supposing that I regarded the Eucharist as instituted *exclusively* for purposes of Communion, and that the Presence of Christ was entirely confined to the act of reception. You did not perceive, and perhaps now will not believe me when I tell you, that I hold the Eucharist to be a Sacrifice, as well as a Communion on a Sacrifice ; to be an act of worship, as well as a means of nourishing the personal religious life of the believer. And so it comes that even *you* have not fully understood my meaning. You are quite right in holding that " the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed . . . . received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." You have, however, on the one hand, omitted a very important little word, "*taken and received ;*" and you have also attached to the word " faithful " a modern and loose meaning, at variance with that strict theological meaning in which I used it, *viz.* the whole company of the baptized, *good and bad* alike. This last word, therefore, will show you that even if you were right in limiting the " Real Presence " to the act of reception, you were wholly wrong in supposing it to be dependent upon the " subjective " qualifications of the reci-

piant. The first word, too, which you omitted—that little word “*taken*”—(which, be it observed, is simply a reiteration of what I said even more emphatically fifty years before in my Twenty-eighth Article, “*given, taken, and eaten,*”)—will prove to you that the Real Presence takes possession of the elements *before* the act of reception. For if Christ be not in your hand as you hold the consecrated Bread before the communicant, and say the words of administration, how can you *give* Christ? And if Christ be not in the communicant’s hand as he receives that Bread from you, how can he be said to *take* Christ? No! Christ is there, and He is received by the “faithful,” good and bad alike,—by the one to mercy; by the other to judgment: and therefore He is not “subjectively,” but “objectively” there. And He is “objectively” there, too, *before* the act of reception; for He is “given” by your hand, and “taken” by the hand of the communicant. And He was there, too, even before you communicated yourself; for did I not tell you to say to yourself, “The Body of our Lord . . . take and eat *this* . . .”? How sadly must you have lost the meaning of those solemn words, if you could think they meant anything else than that that bit of consecrated Bread which you held in your hand *was* the “Body of our Lord,” . . . “which was to preserve, &c. . .”

No ! deeply as I thank you for recognising the “reality” of that Presence ; greatly as I honour you for your zeal in preparing those committed to your charge for a due reception ; greatly as I thank you for your constant efforts to increase the number of your communicants, and the frequency of their Communion,—I cannot acquit you of having read my words partially, and therefore erroneously. Will you then,—all of you,—listen a few minutes more whilst I tell you what my full doctrine on this most important point is ? I will give it you completely and definitely as it stands in my Catechism, and then I must leave you to see for yourselves how it fits in with all my other Formularies and Articles, of which it professes to be my last deliberate summary and interpretation.

First, observe, I tell you that the *primary reason* of this ordinance is that it should be for “the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby.” Of the Holy Eucharist as a Continual Sacrifice I will not here speak at length. I only wish to let the Receptionists observe that I do not regard “Communion” as the primary reason of the Ordinance, but as a secondary,—albeit a most important, reason. And this ought to lead them to see that they

are in error in two points, one of theory, the other of practice :—of theory, in that they confine the Presence to the act of participation ; of practice, in that they do not regard it as an act of worship in which *all* should join, independently of its secondary application to those of them “ that are minded to receive.” To be sure, my Rubrics in the Liturgy are not so clear on this subject as I could wish them to be. That is owing to the many and important structural changes that Service underwent. But here in my Catechism you have my plain meaning, that the Holy Eucharist was ordained as a great memorial act of worship, independently of its application as a means of grace. Go then and read my Rubrics in this light ; and do not accuse me of limiting the attendance at the Great Central Act of Christian Worship to a select few. No ! let me have my “ Young men, and maidens, my old men and children,” yea, my very “ babes and sucklings, out of whose mouth God hath ordained praise” to join in this my “ Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving.”

Next, observe that I treat of the Eucharist itself under *three* distinct parts.

First, the “ outward sign, ordained by Christ Himself,”—that is the “ Signum Sacramenti.” or, as it is often called, simply the “ Sacramentum.” It is in this sense that I sometimes



speak of the Bread after consecration as the "Sacrament."

Next, there is the "thing signified,"—that is the "*Res Sacramenti*,"—according to language long prevalent in the Church of Christ, and which I have here, for clearness sake, adopted.

And third, there are the "benefits or effects of receiving the same,"—that is, according to the same well-known Latin division, the "*Virtus Sacramenti*."

We have then first the word "*Sacramentum*," which is often used as *inclusive* of the whole three divisions;—sometimes too, though somewhat incorrectly and unwisely, used *exclusively* of *any* one of these three;—but more often, and with greater philological exactness, used simply for the *first* of them, *i.e.* the "outward sign," the "badge," as it were, of our military allegiance as the soldiers of Christ. But in addition to this one word "*Sacramentum*," we have, as you see, three phrases, which, if more constantly used, would prevent all confusion of idea and language; *viz.* 1, the "*Signum Sacramenti*;" 2, the "*Res Sacramenti*;" and 3, the "*Virtus Sacramenti*."

And here I have a word for the Virtualist. He saw plainly enough that in this last sense of the word, as the "*Virtus Sacramenti*," the wicked were not "*partakers of Christ*," as I ex-

pressed it in my Twenty-ninth Article, and have here explained as "*partakers of the benefits of*" the Eucharist. Here then is one source of his error ; for, comparing the two formulæ together, he quite rightly took the words "*partakers of the benefits of*" (Christ) in my Catechism to be equivalent to the words "*partaking of Christ*" in the Article ; and so he came to think that "Christ," and the "*benefits of Christ,*" were one and the same in my teaching ; that is, that the "*virtus*" Sacramenti, was the same as the "*res*" Sacramenti ; and hence his theory of the "Virtual" Presence. He did not, however, observe that I had previously told him that the wicked *did* receive the "*res*" Sacramenti ; for I say plainly "that the Body and Blood of Christ, are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful."

Now I have already explained this word "*faithful*" to you ; but as I still see a smile of incredulity steal over your faces, let me refer you to my Nineteenth Article in which I define the "Visible Church of Christ to be a congregation of *faithful* men,"—and in which Visible Church thus defined I further (in the Twenty-sixth Article) state "*the evil* must ever be mingled with the good." The "*faithful*" then include good and bad alike ; and as the "*faithful*" receive the "*res* Sacramenti,"—the *wicked* among the

“faithful” must receive the “res Sacramenti.” For how could it possibly be otherwise, if, as you all admit, the wicked do receive the “signum Sacramenti.” The “signum” is merely the “form,” of which the “res” is the “substance;” and he who, “void of a lively faith,” carnally and visibly presses with his teeth the Sacrament, *i. e.* the “signum” or sign, must also receive sacramentally the “res” or thing signified; yet, although he “receives” Christ, he “is in no way a partaker of Christ,” *i. e.* a participator in the benefits or virtue of Christ.

This may seem unintelligible to you. But let us take a familiar illustration. “Light” is necessary to enable the “eye” to discern “objects.” Go into a dark room. There are objects in it; you can feel them; *they are there*. In a certain sense too you see them, for the eye *is staring at them*, though from want of light as the proper medium, the eye discerns them not. It is not as if you were blind. The eye is still exercising its powers, though light is required to make those powers effective; and the objects in the room are just as much there in darkness as in light. So is it in this case. “Faith,” as I tell you in the Twenty-eighth Article, is the “mean,” or “medium” of due reception; just as light is the “medium” of sight to the eye. The receptive powers may indeed be *exercised*

without "faith," just as the powers of seeing may be *exercised* without "light." For the power of reception is not removed by want of faith, any more than the power of sight is removed by want of light. But what I say is that the receptive powers cannot be exercised *effectually* without faith, any more than the power of sight can be exercised *effectually* without light. And in this sense those that be "void of a lively faith" "partake not of Christ," *i.e.* they receive none of the "benefits" of Christ, nor *discern* the Lord's Body,—any more than the "eye" without "light" receives the "benefits" of sight and *discerns* the objects around it. There is a "receiving" of Christ, without a "partaking" of Him; just as there is a "looking at" the objects in the dark room, without "seeing" them: "Christ" is there, whether there be "lively faith" or not; just as the objects are there, whether there be light or not; and the wicked *receive* the "*res Sacramenti*," although they do not *partake of* the "*virtus Sacramenti*." For to receive the "signum" without the "*res*," the "form" of a thing without the "substance" of it, is, if you consider it, a plain contradiction of reason and language. And therefore I never for a moment supposed that when, in my Twenty-ninth Article, I told you that the wicked were not "partakers of Christ," I should have been so

misunderstood. Here, however, in my Catechism I tell you plainly, that the "evil mingled with the good," the wicked among the faithful do "receive" Christ, although they do not "partake of" Him; their powers of sacramental reception, though exercised, are not exercised *effectually*, through their want of a "lively faith."

It is for the sake of the Virtualist that I have thus enlarged on this question, as I see how easy it was that he should have been thus misled. Nevertheless, my final interpretation in my Catechism was plain, and he should have read my Articles in the light of that interpretation, and not have trusted to his private judgment in the matter. I had distinctly told him, and all of you, that the "Church hath authority in controversies of faith," and he should have remembered what was my last authoritative utterance on the subject, and turned to that first. Here, in my Catechism, I trust all can find my words plain. But should there still be any doubt, and should there be wanted an interpretation to interpret the interpretation, and a catechism to explain the Catechism, then still appeal to me, and do not trust to any private interpretation of your own. Convocation can always give you my voice on the matter: do not, therefore, let your own be heard, but in case of doubt appeal for mine.

Thus far our good Mother Church.

And now, my reader, let me remind you what has all along been my object in this examination. It has been to meet the opinion current among us that our Church does not hold the doctrine of the "Real Objective Presence" in the Holy Eucharist. And in order to get you to see that this opinion, however popular, is an erroneous one, I have first stated to you all other forms of faith held by individual members of the Church on this subject, and have then successively arraigned them before the tribunal of the Church herself, who gives us, in her Catechism, her own opinion upon those very Articles and Rubrics, which have thus been so variously interpreted. Here, as I have endeavoured to shew, she throws for us the full daylight of her own final interpretation and judgment upon them, instead of leaving us to grope blindly about in that dark, unreal, shadowy cave of private opinion, in which all these controversies have had their birth.

True, I have in the course of the trial made the Church give a passing utterance upon another question, besides that of the "Real Objective Presence;" but that, however important in itself, is not essential to the purpose of this present essay. You will not believe, and I do not ex-

pect to bring you to believe, that when the Church says that the Eucharist was ordained "for the continual remembrance of the Sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby," that she thereby commits her members to the full doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice. No; here you will all cry out against me—Realist and Virtualist, you will both make common cause with the Symbolist, and say that "remembrance" here means simply a "recollection of," a "calling to mind" the death of Christ; and you will fall back, all of you, on the old cry, "The Church of England knows neither priest nor altar;" and therefore, you will say, she can have no sacrifice."

It will be in vain that I shall call your attention to the fact that the words of this final judgment are not what you virtually assert them to be, "*a remembrance of the death of Christ,*" but "*the continual remembrance of the Sacrifice of the death of Christ,*" and that these are all significant terms which find no adequate expression in your paraphrase of the judgment. It will be in vain that I shall tell you that this expression "remembrance" has a distinct theological import, and contains a technical reference to the *μνημόσυνον* or memorial sacrifice. It will be in vain that I shall tell you that of the words "Do this in remembrance of Me," the Church

of Christ for 1500 years knew no other interpretation than "Offer this as a memorial sacrifice," and that it is only among individual members of our own branch of the Church, during the last 300 years, that any other interpretation has been known. It will be in vain that I shall endeavour to fortify this fact by telling you that all Greek scholars will admit that in that later form of the language in which this sentence was written, the original words translated "Do this" did often mean, and must mean in many other passages\* of Scripture, "Offer this sacrifice;" and that the testimony of the philologist is only in harmony with that of the Jewish Ritualist, who will inform you that our Lord, when He said those words and per-

\* I extract the following from Mr. Carter's work on the Priesthood, p. 85:—Exod. xxix. 36-39. Lev. vi. 22; ix. 7. Ex. x. 25. Lev. iv. 20. Numb. ix. 2. Deut. xvi. 1. 2 Kings xxiii. 21. 2 Chron. xxx. 1, 2; xxxv. 1. Ezra vi. 19. Cf. also Heb. xi. 28, and Luke ii. 27, as compared with the *δοῦναι θυσίαν* of v. 24. In Gen. iv. 7, our word "do" is a translation of the sacrificial words, *προσφέρειν προσφορά*.

The *ποιεῖν* in later Greek is equivalent to the earlier word *πέγειν*, just as in Latin the "facere" ("cum faciam vitula," &c.) came to be used for the earlier "agere" (as in "hoc age.")

And similarly all the Greek Fathers use *ποιεῖν* of the Eucharistic sacrifice, and the Latin Fathers use "facere," "missam facere," to "offer Mass."

Also, I would beg the reader to refer to the very complete table of this use of the word *ποιεῖν*, given in the appendix to the recently published charge of the Bishop of Salisbury.



formed that act, *was* using *sacrificial* language, and performing a *sacrificial act*; and so if we are merely in your sense of the word “do,” to “Do this”—*i.e.* to do what Christ did—we must also perform some sacrificial act, and use some sacrificial language.

It will be in vain that I shall tell you that, in what is, perhaps, the earliest Christian writing extant, earlier certainly than S. Paul's Epistles, the Eucharist, as described in the actual form in which the first founders of our faith celebrated it, is called the “tremendous sacrifice.” It would be in vain also for me to quote to you passage after passage out of the works of the author of this part of the Catechism, Bishop Overall, in which the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice is strongly insisted on, in order to shew you that the Church in his day did maintain it, and must have thoroughly understood what the Bishop meant by this first question and answer of his, which she formally adopted as her own.

No!—you will say—the Church here, in her Catechism, is not distinct enough for me; and although I quite allow that for your interpretation of her language you have an enormous weight of precedent, scholarship, and ritual lore to shew, still the language of the Church here in her Catechism does seem to me to admit of my interpretation as well as yours. I cannot bring

myself to see that her words mean what you say they mean *and nothing else* ; and so, as we are here still left in the dark cave of private interpretation, as you call it, I prefer to stick to my corner of it, which is snugger, and, with your leave, not quite so superstitiously dark as yours. For see ! my good mother Church gives me a little light in my corner from her previous formularies, to which, as we are now both in the cave of private opinion, you will of course admit my claim. I will just let my ray of light shoot across to you, that it may illuminate your dark corner. Here it is : “ The sacrifices of masses, in the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.” And let me add to the brilliancy of this light by telling you, my friend, that you will not find the word “ altar ” in your Prayer-Book, and that when the Church does speak of “ sacrifice ” it is only—as you will remember she quoted to us in the course of her judgment—as a “ sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.” And now to blind your unaccustomed eyes with the full flood of my brightest light, let me call your attention to the fact that the service is throughout called a communion, and that even in what you are pleased to call the final judgment of the Church,

D

the question to that very answer on which you build up your mediæval structure of sacrifice, tells you that it is "the Supper of the Lord."

A thousand thanks, my good Sir, I shall say, for your kind efforts to illuminate my dark corner. But I can assure you, you need not be under the slightest apprehension that my eyes have suffered from so sudden an intrusion of your pure white light. The fact is, my corner of the cave of private opinion is not quite so dark as you take it to be; and our good Mother Church, whilst, as I am happy to hear, she has so kindly favoured you, has by no means forgotten me, but has also given me a little light, from precisely the same quarter as you apparently receive yours. For that terrible Thirty-first Article, which you thought would simply annihilate me, is, in reality, my strong tower of strength; and I will now tell you why.

Perhaps you have never had any talk with those strange people you call "Romanists," or ever perused their articles and formularies of faith. To be sure, they don't often visit your corner of the cave. They sometimes, however, pay me a visit in mine, and we talk over things together, just in that nice, friendly, good-tempered kind of way, in which I suppose you and me to be chatting now. I also have on my shelves certain volumes, which, in your expressive

phraseology, you would describe as bearing the authoritative "mark of the beast." Now it may interest you to know, that I have never yet met with any of these "Romanists" who did not admit that in the period before the Reformation gross abuses existed, arising partly from a want of proper dogmatic instruction, and partly from the laxity of ecclesiastical discipline. He will further tell you, that amongst these were superstitions and abuses connected with the sacrifice of the Mass. These, he will tell you, were divisible into two classes:—1, False views of the nature of that sacrifice, and of its connection with the one only Sacrifice, regarding it in fact as a bloody sacrifice, and as a repetition in like manner of that one Sacrifice; and, 2, coupled with these false views of the sacrifice, and arising out of them, a superstitious use of it, as if by the payment of a set sum of money a man could simply buy so many masses for the salvation of his soul, independently of the one Sacrifice of the Cross, and independently too of that personal faith, on the part of those who offer it, which is necessary to make the application of the Sacrifice effectual for the remission of sins. These, as I say, he will tell you, were corruptions of the true Eucharistic faith then widely prevalent, which his Church, carefully sifting the grain from the chaff in a Council whose sittings were spread

over many years, swept away for ever, guarding against their recurrence by the enforcement of fuller instruction and stricter discipline, and also by clearly expounding her true teaching in a series of distinctly defined dogmatic statements, which all men should in fairness read before they presume to say what the teaching of the Church of Rome on this, or any other subject, really is.

And it is exactly against these, and other such like then prevalent errors, that our Articles, as read by the light in my corner of the cave, seem to protest. It is beyond my purpose now to explain to you *how* they seem to me to do this. But I will merely observe—just to indicate the kind of light our good Mother Church throws on my corner—that, taking the sentences in their natural order, I read the *latter* part of the Thirty-first Article by the light of the *first*, which I take to be the “because,” of which the *latter* part is the “wherefore.” It does not therefore seem to me to throw any slur on the true doctrine of the *sacrifice* of the *Mass*, as *authoritatively defined* by the Church of Rome (which derives all its meaning and virtue from “that offering of Christ *once* made”), to find the Article protesting against the “*Sacrifices of Masses*, in which it *was commonly said* that, &c.” No, my friend, I would simply ask you, if you and your friends

were to call a synod together in your corner of the cave, for the express purpose of protesting against the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice thus authoritatively defined, would your protest adopt the language of the Thirty-first Article? I am sure one glance at the resolutions passed in the 22nd sitting of the Council of Trent, held in the year 1562,\* would shew you how wholly inapplicable, how wholly inadequate, such language would be as a protest against them. On the other hand I would ask you, if the erroneous teaching, and corrupt practices, which I have told you are admitted on all hands to have existed then, did exist now, and you and your friends wished to protest against them, would not the language of the Thirty-first Article be sufficient for your purpose?

Again, with regard to your expression, "Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," on which you rely so much, let me tell you that that expression was no invention of the Church at the time of the Reformation, but had all along been used in the Latin of the Sarum Missal, and is still to be

---

\* It will be seen from this date that the too common theory of interpretation which regards our Articles as a protest against the Council of Trent, and the authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome, is chronologically absurd. For this Thirty-first Article, for instance, was compiled ten years before the corresponding decrees of the Council of Trent, appearing as the Thirtieth of the Articles published in 1552.

found in the Latin of the Roman Missal, and that, too, in such a position in the Liturgy as makes its reference to the actual oblation unmistakeable. And as you have quoted me these words, it is only fair that I should quote you another expression in the same prayer of oblation, *viz.* "this our bounden duty and service," which you will also find in the same unmistakeable reference in the Latin. Therefore, you must allow yourself to be in this dilemma: *either* the Church of England before the Reformation, and the Church of Rome now, *reject* the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, *or* else the compilers of our reformed Liturgy deliberately put into the mouths of their priests English words, to be used with a totally different reference and sense, in the month of June, 1549, to that in which these same priests had been using these same expressions in Latin in the month of May, 1549, and during all the previous months of their ordination, and that without the slightest hint of an instruction to these priests that the reference and meaning of these words was to be changed.

This is the dilemma in which you must find yourself, and from *which you cannot possibly escape*, so long as you keep to your corner of the cave. And I have a full right to press this dilemma upon you, because it is one entirely of *your own* making; for so long as you refuse to accept this

meaning of the Church's final judgment on this question, relieved as it is, in a great measure, from all appearance of a private interpretation of my own by its concurrence with the universal faith and practice of the Church for fifteen centuries, you do bring this dilemma upon yourself.

And lest, instead of boldly facing it like an honest Englishman, you should still be taking refuge in "names" and "titles," which seem to you to indicate an uncompromising belief in the Eucharist, as exclusively a feast or communion, and not a sacrifice, let me tell you that the expression "Supper of the Lord" (*Coena Domini*) to which you have referred as occurring in the Catechism, is equally in use in the Church of Rome at the present day, as it was throughout the whole of Christendom before the Reformation, as the authorised name for the Eucharist in its twofold aspect, as inclusive, that is, both of sacrifice and communion ; and therefore, if you apply it to prove the rejection of the "sacrifice" in the English Church, you must also in all fairness apply it to prove the rejection of the "sacrifice" in the Roman Church.\*

---

\* In German, the recognised name among Catholics for this Sacrament is "das heilige Abendmahl"—"the holy evening-meal," an expression even still more emphatically favourable to this theory of non-sacrifice, and yet no German Catholic would allow one on the strength of it to



No ! your corner of the cave, my friends, snug as it may be,—unprofaned as it is by the intrusion of sacrificial vestments, sacrificial incense, and sacrificial lights, and all the other embarrassing and superstitious usages which are fashionable in mine—will for all that leave you no peace. It is full of logical inconsistencies ; it swarms with all kinds of historical difficulties and dilemmas. You may indeed find less *outward* trouble in it, less of “posture-makings, manual dexterities, flexions, and genuflexions,” and all that sort of thing ; but depend upon it, *within*, in your thoughts if you be a thinking man, in your affections if you be a loving man, you will find no peace so long as you remain there. There will always be some hidden misgiving paralysing your devotional efforts, some lurking flaw disturbing the logical sequence of your thoughts.

Come out, then, I would say, come boldly out from the cave, and accept this first sentence of your Church’s final judgment, in that sense which is alone consistent with the universal voice of the Church for fifteen centuries, and the all but universal voice of the Church since ; and

“Take not the rustic murmur of your bourg,  
For the great wave which echoes round the world.”

And here I fancy I hear the voice of good

---

assert that his Church did not regard the Eucharist as a Sacrifice.

Mother Church speaking a word of encouragement to each of you in turn :—

Do not, she says to the Symbolist, do not think you will be robbed of the beauty of your belief by taking my words in the sense here put upon them. I have already commended the fervour and devotion with which you make your simple “commemoration,” with which you “set apart the bread and wine for a holy use,” and with which you partake of them “as symbols” of that you so much love. Such fervour and devotion all my priests must have. But can you not transfer them to *that particular form of “commemoration”* which I have commanded? Can you not “set apart the bread and wine” for a far “*holier* use,” and at the precise time ordered. For I bid you, long before the consecration, at the very outset almost of the service, *offer* them in solemn “oblation” to God, partly because they are destined to become the subjects of the marvellous operation of God the Holy Ghost, and partly in token of our dependence upon God for all the bounties of the natural creation—upon God who “bringeth food out of the earth, and wine that maketh glad the heart of man, and oil to make him a cheerful countenance, and bread to strengthen man’s heart.” Can you not, also, if I remove *your* “symbols,” and give you the priceless realities you so much

love instead, still find your simple, childlike, natural love of symbolism satisfied with *those other "symbols,"* with which I have so richly surrounded this great mystery of our faith. For do not suppose that all this beauty of ritual, and splendour of outward adornment with which I have enriched it, is a mere chance form, chosen at random, or æsthetically devised to captivate and allure. No, it has all gradually built itself up out of the natural instincts of loving, faithful hearts like yours; it is all the gradually-developed creation of saints of old, whose burning zeal and eager affections could not brook the cold formal restraint which some think necessary to a spiritual worship, but were forced to express in outward act that love and that faith which glowed so richly within them. And that you have, each in your measure, that same love, and that same faith, who can doubt? And who can doubt, too, that it will likewise find its *natural* outward expression in the same form and manner as theirs. Yes, it has ever been so, since my children first began in these last days to apprehend my full meaning, and realise the stupendous majesty and beauty of my Eucharistic service,—those who have begun with the truest and sincerest belief in plain, simple "evangelical" statement, have had in the end the widest grasp and the keenest perception of the full sum of

“Catholic” truth; the most devout “memorialist” has ever become the most devout assistant at the “memorial sacrifice;” and the most zealous dispenser of the “symbolic bread and wine to the faithful few at God’s board” has become the most zealous priest to offer “the real sacrifice at God’s altar before the whole company of the faithful.”

Come, then, you whose hearts burn with love for your Redeemer, and whose tears course down your cheeks, as, at your memorial feast, you count the sacred wounds of that Precious Body, and catch the sacred drops of that Precious Blood;—*here* shall you find in the appointed symbolism the full and natural expression of your love. Here, as you tell once more, in language more effectual than speech, “that sweet, sad story of old;”—*here*, “as you set forth Christ crucified *evidently* before your people’s eyes,”—*here* shall each act, each gesture, each “upward glancing of the eye,” each outward bending of the hand, remind you of the acts, the gestures, the looks, the motions of Him you love. Each vesture you put on, and each cross you wear,—every step you take, and every word you utter,—each bowing of the head, and each bending of the knee, will be a memorial to you of the sufferings of the Crucified—will be symbols to you of each momentous act in the drama of

Calvary ;—and so, with your whole nature, body and soul, thought and speech, feeling and gesture, bound up together in one full rapture of fervent, passionate love, shall you kiss the very feet of Him you adore—yea, wash them with your tears as you gaze in penitential ecstasy upon the consecrated Victim, and wipe them with the hairs of your head, as you kneel in reverential awe before the presence of the Incarnate God.

And you, too,—she will say to the Virtualist,—you, whose zeal in stirring up in the young of my flock that repentance and faith which alone can make their reception a *virtual*, as well as a real one,—has it not ever been your endeavour to do this by dwelling fondly and fervently upon the “power of Christ’s Cross,” to make them loathe their sin, and love their Saviour?

*Here*, then, in my Eucharistic service have I provided you with the very best means of teaching them this power, and of “holding the Cross before their very eyes.” You know how far more powerful the eye is, as a teacher, than the ear, especially with the young. In your Sunday schools you trust to your Scripture print more than to your Scripture story ; and in your sermons to your young, you teach them in parables,—by similes, figures, anecdotes,—spoken pictures, in fact, rather than in the direct language of truth itself. Yes ! you do all this,—

“Because things seen are mightier than things heard.”

And it will only be in keeping with your own special principles of teaching, and in furtherance of your own special object of preparing your communicants for a worthy reception, if you let them be present at that great memorial Sacrifice in which I bid you, in solemn and impressive Eucharistic symbolism, “shew forth the Lord’s death till He come.”

And to the Realist she will say :—You said rightly that when I spoke of Christ being “verily and indeed” present, I could not mean otherwise than that He was “really,” and not merely “virtually” present. You did not, however, recognise in the Eucharist anything more than a Communion, and could not, therefore, see the meaning and object of a Presence previous to reception. *Here*, however, you have a use to which to put that previous presence. It is a use which constitutes the highest act of Christian worship,—*viz.* an act of sacrifice. It is that act round which all those other acts of prayer, thanksgiving, praise, adoration, and communion revolve. Nay, it is the *only* act in which *true worship* is attained, and by which you can at all express the real relations which exist between man and his Maker.

Prayer indeed is good : you all must pray, if you be Christians at all ; but here you have

reached no point of *worship*; you shew God no honour different in *kind*, however much it may differ in degree, from that which you pay to your fellow-men—for to them you pray as often as you ask the help you believe they have power to bestow. Besides, as you only pray when you have something to pray *for*, either for yourselves or others, prayer must ever be an act having more reference to self and to humanity than to God. Your ordinary *offerings* again, though they exceed the value of prayer, in virtue of their unselfishness, still fall short of the “honour due unto the Lord.” Money you offer also to your fellow-men. The fruits of the earth you also present in token of fealty or of honour to others of your race. Nay, even in that very “living Sacrifice which you make of your souls and bodies to the Lord as your reasonable service,” you have not yet reached the point at which you can say you are yielding that to God which God *alone* can claim, and which to Him *alone* is due. For there have been those who, in return for some signal act of benevolence,—deliverance from threatened death, or rescue from the depths of misery,—have yielded their whole powers of body and mind in grateful service to the benefactor who has saved them. No! man himself, at his very best, can never be a worthy sacrifice to his Creator; he can never be a “victim with-

out spot or blemish." There is but one offering which man can offer God—there is but one sacrifice in which a worthy act of worship is paid by man to God. It is that "pure offering which shall in every place be offered unto God's name" (Malachi i. 11.) It is that Sacrifice once made on Calvary, for ever presented in Heaven, and continually represented by the Church on earth in obedience to the command, "Do this." You can never know what "worship" is until you have offered the sacrifice of the new covenant. You can never know what God is in His relations to man until you have offered the Son of God Himself as your act of homage and propitiation to the Father. Neither, again, can you offer this Sacrifice aright unless you have first *adored* the Victim. For you must recognise the infinite glory of the Victim before you can realise the stupendous majesty of the Sacrifice at which you assist; and until you recognise this last, your ideas of God in His mercy and in His might will ever remain inadequate, and your acts of homage ever fall short of the true standard of Christian worship.

You see, then, what a high and holy use I would have you put that Presence to, independently of and before Communion, when I tell you that the primary object of the institution of this greatest mystery of our faith was, that it



should be “the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby.”

It was not my original intention to have taken the reader at all into this question of the Eucharistic sacrifice, neither have I entered into the depths of dogmatic theology it involves. But as the final decision of the Church upon the Holy Eucharist starts with an assertion which seems to me to imply this doctrine, I could not altogether pass it by. I have endeavoured, therefore, to shew that, whilst, on the one hand, the meaning which her words convey to my mind is one consentient both with the unvarying testimony of the Church for fifteen centuries, and the all but universal belief the Church since,—the other interpretation, whether held by Symbolist, Virtualist, or Realist, involves a dilemma from which there is absolutely no escape. Far be it from me to suppose that I shall have thereby convinced these latter that I am right and they are wrong. I shall be quite content if I have only induced them to regard the question as an open one, and a matter demanding further arbitration. Let neither of us,—I would say—accuse the other, either of teaching what the Church does not sanction, or of refusing to teach what she does ; but let us both seek

the further interpretation of the Church, and petition Convocation to explain this first answer of the Catechism.

But, as I say, all this has been a mere digression, and has nothing to do with the main purpose of the present Essay, which was to shew that the popular opinion that the Church of England does not hold the doctrine of the "Real Objective Presence" is an erroneous opinion. In order to shew this, I have brought all other current forms of Eucharistic belief to the test of the Church's own final judgment and have found them wanting. That judgment, so far as it concerns the particular point in hand, is a very short and simple one ; it is

"That the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."

And, I repeat it, tested by this judgment, all doctrines short of that of the "Real Objective Presence" are found to be deficient.

For I boldly affirm that—

(1). No Symbolist *can* say that the Church of England tells him the Body and Blood of Christ are *not* received, when she distinctly asserts as her deliberate ultimatum that they "*are*."

(2). No Virtualist *can* maintain that the Church of England teaches him they are merely received in "effect," when she distinctly pro-

E

claims, in a sentence from which there is no appeal, that they are received "verily and indeed."\*

(3) And no mere Realist *can* assert that the Church of England teaches him they are thus "verily and indeed" present, but only in and by virtue of the act of due reception; for she tells him, in words which form her last *résumé* of the whole matter, not only that they are present in an act of *undue* reception, for the evil among the faithful receive them equally with the good, but also that they are present *before* the act of reception, for they are in the hand of the communicant as "taken," before he receives them, and they are also in the hand of the priest, before they are "given" (as the Article says) into the hand of the communicant.

I fearlessly assert, that no man can deny this simple induction from the words of the

---

\* It is, alas! a well-known fact that many of our Clergy boldly declare that the Church of England does maintain the Real Presence, though they do not scruple themselves to hold and teach views utterly at variance with it. I extract the following from a speech of Mr. Hillyard, a well-known "Revisionist" in the diocese of Lincoln: "No Roman Catholic, not even the Pope himself, could have found words more emphatically teaching the Doctrine of the Real Presence than those of the Catechism '*verily and indeed* taken and received.'"

I have also heard of a Family Prayer-Book in which these words have been erased, and "virtually and in a figure" substituted for them.

Church Catechism, without doing violence to his own logical convictions. And however fondly he may turn a lingering gaze on this or that expression of his Communion office, or of his Thirty-nine Articles, it is in vain. For the Catechism is not to be explained by the Articles nor even by the Communion office itself, but is itself the Church's authoritative explanation of them both.

And this induction is all that is necessary to establish beyond all suspicion of a doubt the doctrine of the "Real Objective Presence" in the Holy Eucharist, as the doctrine of the Church of England. For if the Presence be "objective," and not "subjective;" that is, if it take place before reception, and exist as a fact independently of it, no one will deny but that it then must take place at the time of and by virtue of the act of consecration. And therefore the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, which maintains that "the elements of Bread and Wine, when consecrated by a properly ordained priest, are, by the operation of the Holy Ghost acting at the time he recites certain words and performs certain actions, so changed, that they become then and there the Body and Blood of Christ, and remain so, whether 'received' or not;" this doctrine, I say, is here unmistakeably proved to be the doctrine

of the Church of England, as it is the doctrine of the Holy Catholic Church throughout the world. And the prevalent belief among us, that the Church of England does *not* hold the doctrine of the "Real Objective Presence" is therefore an erroneous belief.

I have thus freely and fully stated the reasons why I am unable to concur in the first of the two popular beliefs with which this Essay deals. God grant, that to many of my readers these reasons may have commended themselves as valid. For otherwise it will be useless their going on with me to the examination of the second of these two popular beliefs. For in endeavouring to prove that this too is a groundless and unjustifiable belief, I shall throughout take it for granted that the first has been proved to be erroneous, and that the Church of England does recognise the "Real Objective Presence" as her Eucharistic doctrine, and repudiates every other form of doctrine short of that.

## PART II.\*

---

# THE COUNCIL OF TRENT AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

ON THE

## DOCTRINE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

---

“Pax hominibus bonæ voluntatis.”

---

IN the first part of this Essay I have endeavoured to shew that what is commonly called the “Doctrine of the Real Objective Presence” is held by the Church of England, and that she distinctly repudiates, in her Catechism, the other doctrines commonly imputed to her.

Nothing has been said hitherto of the *mode* of that Presence, nor of the *character* of that change in the elements of Bread and Wine by which it is effected. These will, in some measure, form

---

\* I wish here to state that it is mainly through hints and expressions in the “Eirenicon,” and other of Dr. Pusey’s writings, that I have been led into that train of thought and study which has resulted in the Second Part of this Essay.

the subject of examination in this second part, in which it will be my object to shew that the popular opinion, which maintains that "the Church of England, when she *rejects* the doctrine of 'Transubstantiation,' uses the word in the *same* sense in which the Church of Rome uses it when she *accepts* it," is an erroneous opinion.

But, before I enter upon this part of the subject, let me again remind the reader that I do so altogether under protest; that for me a simple belief in the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, as given by the Church, is sufficient; and that it is only with the view of removing obstacles to the acceptance of this doctrine, that I pursue the subject further. It is commonly thought, and, as I venture to maintain, rightly thought, that the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence does involve, or rather is simply another mode of expressing, the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation; and the plain fact, therefore, that our Church rejects some doctrine bearing this latter name, must ever prove an obstacle to the reception of the former doctrine, until it can be proved that the doctrine so rejected has nothing in common with the Roman doctrine save the name. When Archbishop Manning says that the clergy of the Church of England are already saving his own

clergy the necessity of preaching Transubstantiation, he says what I am glad to believe is true ; but it is plain that so long as our own people have a notion that what Archbishop Manning praises us for maintaining is exactly that which the Marian martyrs were burnt for denying, so long will his praises be as unwelcome as they are unsought.

Now, as one of my present objects is to shew that by the word "Transubstantiation" the English Church really means "Transaccidentation," I must first explain to the reader what is meant by the word "accidents" and what by the word "substance."

I will explain theoretically first, and will take an instance in illustration afterwards.

By the "accidents" of a thing is meant *all that we know of it from our senses*. The size,\*

---

\* The scientific reader will please to observe that I am, throughout this examination talking "ad populum," and using popular language. It is, therefore, sufficient for my purpose to say that we learn the size of a thing from the eye, whatever theory I may hold as to the "acquired" powers of sight. And so with regard to this whole question of "substance" and "accidents," I wish to remark that as the doctrine of Transubstantiation is based upon a particular meaning of the word "substance," I have only to treat of it as bearing that meaning, wholly irrespective of any modern scientific theories with which it may or may not be at variance. The question here is not between theology and science, but between one form of theology and another, and we can only compare the two together by adopting their own language and ideas. (See further on this question Note A. in the Appendix.)



the shape, and colour of a thing, for instance, we learn from the eye. The touch tells us whether it be hard or soft, solid or liquid, rigid or elastic, &c. Its scent we learn from our sense of smell; its flavour from our powers of taste; and its nutritive properties from their effect on our bodily organism. But you well know that the shape, the colour, the size, the smell, and the taste of a thing, are not the thing itself. An alteration will often take place in *its* shape, *its* colour, *its* size, *its* smell, *its* taste; and yet there is something remaining which is unaltered, and which still forces us to regard the thing as IT, whatever changes *its* appearance, &c., may have undergone.

Seeing, then, that we have in a thing two parts—one variable and changeable, the other invariable and permanent—we call the first part the “accidents” of a thing, and we call the second part the “substance” of it. The “accidents” of a thing are discernible by the senses; they belong to the world of sense, and conform to certain laws of extension and visibility which we discern to be in constant operation around us. The “substance” of a thing, on the other hand, is wholly beyond the reach of the senses; it eludes the most subtle analysis we can bring to bear upon it; and we know nothing of it save its existence, to deny which

would be to contradict a universal instinct of the human mind, and to introduce a hopeless irreconcilability between human thought and human language.\*

Let us now take a familiar illustration. You have in your hand, say, a handful of "corn." You know what it looks like, what it feels like, what it tastes like; you know its surface, or primary qualities; and, if you be an analyst, you know also what are its component parts, what are its nutritive elements,—you know its concealed or ultimate qualities. You do not, however, know what it *is*. You know its "accidents"—but you do not know its "substance."

You take it to the miller, and after he has ground it, it comes out "flour." It *is* the same thing you had before, but it *looks* and *feels* quite different—its "accidents" are altered. As, however, the "flour" *is* that which you had in your hand before as "corn," its "substance" remains the same. *Its* form, *its* colour, *its* shape are altered—but IT remains.

You now take it to the baker, and he makes

---

\* I am not here forgetting what a Nominalist would say to this remark of mine: it is sufficient for my purpose to observe that no effort of his has ever succeeded in obliterating the traces of this instinct in the universal usage of language.

bread of it. Here is another transforming process, the results of which are perceptible to sense; but still the thing itself remains, despite all the visible transformations to which you have subjected it. You had it last as a handful of "flour"—you have it now as a loaf of "bread." You have merely altered *its* "accidents," but IT, the real "substance" of that handful of "corn" you once had, remains: it has survived all the changes from "corn" to "flour," and from "flour" to "bread," which its "accidents" have undergone.

Now it is in this well-known sense of the word that the Church of Rome uses it, when she speaks of "Transubstantiation." She speaks in Latin, and not in English, and at the time of the Council of Trent it would be well understood what was meant by the word "substantia." But as we use the word in English in a loose, vague kind of way, and apply it to the "accidents" of a thing,—as, for instance, when we talk about one piece of flannel being of a softer "substance" than another,—one kind of stone being of a harder "substance" than another—one particular kind of food being of a more nourishing "substance" than another—it was necessary for me to explain at the outset what the real meaning of the word is—the only meaning in fact which it bears in mediæval

Latin, and in most of the modern languages into which it has been incorporated.

Now what the Church of Rome means by Transubstantiation is simply this; that whatever that invisible and invariable part was in the Bread before consecration to which we give the name "substance"—and in virtue of which in the instance before given we still talked of the bread as the same thing, whether it appeared to us (in virtue of its "accidents") to be corn, flour, or bread,—that this "substance" of the Bread is by the consecration converted into the "substance" of the Blessed Body of Christ, and that merely the "accidents" of the Bread,—the form, the shape, the colour, the taste, and the nutritive properties of it, remain. Now it is clear that there is here no change whatever implied in the natural world, *i. e.* in the world of sense.\* For all that we knew of

---

\* In order to shew that the view I am here taking of "substance" and "Transubstantiation" is that held by modern Romans, as well as that propounded by the Council of Trent, I would refer my readers to Newman's "Apologia" (p. 375), in which occurs the following remarkable passage: "What do I know of substance or matter? just as much as the greatest philosopher, and that is nothing at all . . . The Catholic doctrine (of Transubstantiation) leaves phenomena alone. It does not say that the phenomena go; on the contrary, it says that they remain. . . It deals with what no one on earth knows anything about. . . ." Dr. Newman then goes on to shew that it is exactly the same with the doctrine of the Trinity.

it before, the Bread is the same after as before consecration. It looks the same, feels the same, tastes the same, and has the same powers of nourishing the bodily organism. The change that takes place is one beyond the reach of the senses, in the invisible and supernatural world, not in the visible and natural world. It is—to use terms familiar to all though not always rightly understood,—a sacramental, a spiritual, a heavenly change, not a sensible, natural, and earthly change. And yet reason forces us to assert this change, or else there is no such thing as the Real Presence.

I am aware that this word “reason” will fall strangely upon some ears, who fancied it would be more my province to defend faith as against reason than to appeal to reason in behalf of faith. I also know that it is no uncommon thing to hear the doctrine of Transubstantiation condemned as “rationalistic.” But all this arises from a misapprehension of the relations between faith and reason. Such an expression, for instance, as that just used, “faith as *against* reason,” is, if we use the words in their proper sense, an impossibility. Faith can *never* be *against* reason. Faith is indeed *superior* to reason. Faith can believe what reason is powerless to demonstrate. Faith can assert what reason is powerless to conceive. But faith can *never*

absolutely *give the lie* to reason. It may and does *supplement* reason, but it can never *contradict* it. It may be *independent* of its dictates; but it can never *do them violence*. And I fearlessly assert that when once the mind grasps the idea of the "Real Objective Presence" aright, it asserts for itself, then and there, the Roman doctrine of "Transubstantiation;" and it cannot deny it, without flatly contradicting reason.

For what is the doctrine of the "Real Objective Presence" as maintained by the Church of England? It asserts in plain language that "what *was* Bread and Wine before consecration, *becomes* after it the Body and Blood of Christ." So far as their accidents are concerned—so far as their natural properties and their relations to the visible world are concerned,—the Bread and Wine remain as before. But whereas they were before both "accidentally" and "substantially" Bread and Wine, now they are merely "accidentally" Bread and Wine, but "substantially" the Body and Blood of Christ. Whereas before they were "things" (*res*),—they are now simply "forms (*signa*) of things." Our Church in her Catechism is careful to avoid speaking of them as "things." She adopts the language of S. Thomas Aquinas, the great Eucharistic poet of the Church, when he says,

Sub diversis speciebus,  
Signis tantum et non rebus  
Latent res eximie.\*

For observe, whereas in her second question she asks what is the “inward part or *thing* signified,” in her first question she asks what is the “outward part or *sign*,” not or “*thing* signifying.” She tells us, therefore, that in the Eucharist the Bread is the sign of Christ; or, as she elsewhere expresses it,—Christ is there under the “form” of Bread,—under the “veil” of Bread. Just as, for instance, the Holy Ghost was present at the baptism of our Lord under the “sign,” the “form,” the “sacramental veil” of a dove. But the “sign,” the “form,” the “veil” of a thing is not the thing itself, cannot be the “substance” of it; any more than the ever-changing outward form of a man is “he,” the “man himself,” that is, the “person.” The very existence of these distinguishing words—“sign,” “form,” “veil,” proves that. All these expressions imply only the accidents of the thing; they tell us only what it is in the world of sense. But it is the “substance” of a thing,

---

\* It is a pity that this verse should have been—doubtless accidentally—omitted in the translation of this hymn given in the “People’s Hymnal,” as it tallies so exactly with the language of our Church Catechism, and forms such an admirable commentary upon it.

not the "accidents" of it, which *is* the thing itself; and our Church distinctly tells us that this real thing of which the other is the form,—this "substance" of which the other is the "accidents,"—this *res* of which the consecrated element is merely the *signum*, is the Body of Christ. And if this be so—if this be her doctrine of the Real Objective Presence—then either there must have been a *change* of substance, or else a primary law of reason is *contradicted*.

That primary law is, that a thing cannot be two things at once in the strict sense of the word "be"—*i.e.* it cannot *substantially* be two things at once. A thing may be "*accidentally*" at one time *one* thing, and at another time *another*; just as, in our instance, the same thing was at one time "*accidentally*" corn, and at another time "*accidentally*" flour. But a thing can never be "*substantially*" two things at once. There cannot be two "*substances*" under one set of "*accidents*." It is not merely that the human mind sinks powerlessly back in every effort to conceive such a thing—for here faith could come to the rescue, and we could believe that which we cannot conceive, and assert that which we cannot demonstrate. No! such a supposition does far more than this—it *flatly contradicts* reason, it does *open violence*



to its dictates. "If a thing is A, it cannot (at the same time and in the same sense of the word) be B," is a law, of the irresistible, uncompromising force of which every child is conscious, however unable he may be to express it in words; and it is this law which is contradicted when we say that the Eucharist is both Bread and the Lord's Body at the same time and in the same sense of the word "is." It can be, and is, "accidentally" Bread; and it can be, and is, "substantially" the Lord's Body; but it cannot be *both* "substantially," any more than it can (at the same time) be *both* "accidentally."

Now the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation is simply the application of this inevitable law to the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence. It is no further expansion of this latter doctrine; it is no attempt, as many think, at "over-defining." It says nothing about the *mode* of this change, or of the *manner* of the Presence implied by it. It simply asserts it as a fact. Search through the whole range of her creeds, catechisms, and councils, and you will find the Church of Rome nowhere attempts to explain *how* this change takes place, and what is the *nature* of it. And as for the *manner* of the Presence, she distinctly tells us "that it is beyond all power of words to express, though

the fact of it can be and ought to be accounted by faith as possible with God." All she does is to demand of her faithful their assent to the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, in the form of a proposition drawn up with express reference to this primary law of human thought. She holds the consecrated wafer before the eyes of the simplest babe in Christ, and says "What is it?" The child answers in the simple language of Scripture, "This is the Lord's Body," and in so answering the child says in thought what the Church expresses for him in formal language, "That there has been a conversion of the whole substance of the Bread into the substance of the Body of Christ."

Either there is this conversion, *or* the simple answer of the child is false. Either there is this Transubstantiation, *or* else the Real Objective Presence is a delusion, and Virtualism and Symbolism must reign triumphant. For to maintain the existence of the two substances together, is not merely to say what is indemonstrable and inconceivable—it is to *contradict* the primary law of thought that "if a thing is A it cannot be B at the same time, and in the same sense of the word *be*."

Many who have been accustomed to regard this terrible decree of Transubstantiation as the main cause of a deadly antagonism existing

between the two Churches for three hundred years, would be surprised to find how small a space it occupies in the volume of the Council of Trent now open before me, and how very little it really states. I will, therefore, quote it in full, not only for the sake of letting objectors see what a mountain they have made of a mole-hill, but also because a perusal of it will at once shew how exactly consonant the explanation above given is with the language of the decree itself :—

Council of Trent, Thirteenth Session, cap. 4.

“Because Christ our Saviour said that that really was His Body which He gave under the form of Bread, therefore the Church of God has always been persuaded, and this Synod now afresh declares, that at the consecration of the Bread and Wine there is a conversion of the whole substance of the Bread into the substance of the Body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the Wine into the substance of His Blood ; which conversion is fitly and properly termed by the Holy Catholic Church Transubstantiation.”

The decree, be it observed, is based upon the bare words of Scripture, and no other reason is given. It is, as I say, simply a form of expression of the same thing. No really fresh assertion is made ; no new doctrine developed.

It was probably through not clearly perceiving this that the negotiations between Bishop Andrewes and Cardinal Bellarmine did not lead to more practical results. It was not observed that the Church of Rome really adds nothing whatever in this formula to the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence. On the contrary, it was distinctly the impression that she did, as the following quotations from Bishop Andrewes will shew. I take them from Mr. Carter's most valuable work on the Priesthood, my obligations to which I desire here to acknowledge.

Quot. 1. "We believe a Real Presence no less than you: *concerning the mode of the Presence we define nothing rashly.*"

Quot. 2. "Christ said, 'This is My Body,' not 'This is My Body *in this mode.*' We agree with you concerning the object; *all the dispute is concerning the mode.*"

Quot. 3. "We hold by a firm belief, that this (the consecrated Bread) is the Body of Christ; of the manner how it is so,—whether 'by,' or 'in,' or 'with,' or 'under,' or 'changeably with,' there is nothing said in the Scripture."

One would, I think, be justified in concluding from these quotations that Bishop Andrewes believed that the Church of Rome (1) *did* define

something concerning the *mode* of the Presence; (2) *did* apply the text of Scripture with some such virtual gloss upon it as is here suggested; and (3) *did* indulge in curious speculations as to whether the Presence took place "by," or "in," or "with," or "under," or "changeably with," instead of being content with the plain words of Scripture.

But the Church of Rome expressly says that the "mode of the Presence cannot be expressed in words." What more distinct repudiation of any idea of recondite speculations,\* or of any wish to define what God had not defined, could be desired? The Church of Rome nowhere says anything about the *mode* of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist, except *negatively* that it is a sacramental, not a carnal,—a supernatural, not a natural, mode of existence.

---

\* To the same purpose we may quote Q. xxxvi. (or xli. in some editions) of the *Catechismus Romanus*. Here the Church of Rome first justifies the word "Transubstantiation" to express the supernatural change, as formed on the analogy of the word "Transformation" as descriptive of changes in the natural world. She then says, "But of this constant advice of the holy Fathers the faithful are to be admonished, that they should avoid curious speculations as to the mode by which such a change as this can be effected: for it is one which is beyond the reach of our perception, and without precedent either in the natural order of changes, or in creation itself. The fact, however, is to be accepted by faith; the manner of the fact should not be curiously inquired into."

With regard to the second quotation it is a little singular that the simplicity of the Roman statement should have been so overlooked. For the decree uses just these very words of Scripture, *with no gloss whatever*, as the sole reason for its assertions. If I might be allowed for a moment to paraphrase it, I should do so thus :—

“ Because Christ has said ‘ This is My Body,’ we believe that it *is* so ; and what we believe in our hearts, we confess with our mouth, and say, ‘ What *was* bread before consecration *is* now Christ’s Body.’ As, however, the unbeliever says,—‘ How *can* this be Christ’s Body, which I see and taste to be bread ?’ we must be more precise in our language, and reply to him, ‘ A thing is not what it *seems* to be, but what it *is* : *i.e.* it is not what it is ‘accidentally,’ but what it is ‘substantially.’ When we say therefore ‘ This is Christ’s Body,’ we use ‘is’ in the strict sense of ‘is substantially.’ To prevent, then, all misconception, we say that ‘ what *was* *substantially* bread before consecration *is* now *substantially* Christ’s Body ; in other words, we proclaim a ‘conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the Body of Christ.’ For if we did not we could not, in any proper sense of the word ‘is,’ say ‘ This *is* Christ’s Body ;’ and we should thus

be unable to accept the plain words of Christ which the Church has taught us to receive as His these 1500 years."

Such I believe to be a true paraphrase of this famous decree, and I leave the reader to judge whether it is any *addition* to the words of Scripture or no.

Some may perhaps think that the insertion of this little word "whole" is an over-defining. A moment's consideration, however, will shew that it is essential to the completeness of the formula. For let us suppose that an object is divided into four equal parts; in each of these parts there will be one-fourth of the original "substance." Let us now imagine a change of the following kind. Let all four parts remain as they were before in the world of sense; *i.e.* let their "accidents" remain the same; on the other hand, let the "substance" of *three* of the parts be changed, so that the three parts though retaining the same appearance *become* something which they were not before. Let, however, the "substance" of the fourth part remain unchanged. Now it is plain that you could not say in this case that the "substance" of the original object had been changed; *i.e.* that the object itself had become something else. No, you could only say that its "substance" had been *partially* changed, and that *three-fourths* of the

original object had become something else. But when the child says "This piece of consecrated bread is the Lord's Body," he does not mean that any portion of it, however small, is *not* that which he declares it to be. No, he means the *whole* of it is the Lord's Body. And therefore the Church would not have faithfully formularised the simple assertion of the child, if she had omitted this important little word "whole."

I have thus endeavoured to shew what the Church of Rome means by her formula on this subject. It is simply applying the touchstone of a primary law of thought to the various forms of error prevalent in men's minds with regard to the Presence in the Holy Eucharist. Those who deny that Presence altogether, as the Symbolist, are tested by it and found wanting. Those who, like the Virtualist, maintain that it is merely a Presence in "effect," and not "in fact," are tested by it and found wanting. Those who, like the Realist, maintain it to be an "actual" Presence, but one dependent upon subjective qualifications in the receiver, and not an objective fact resulting from the consecration, are also tested by it and found wanting. No! it is only the simple childlike believer in the plain words of Scripture,—it is only the unhesitating, unquestioning maintainer of the Real



Objective Presence, that comes to this touchstone and is found to be pure gold. And we shall find later on that it is also a protest against that perversion of the true faith, which maintains this Real Objective Presence to be a "natural" one.

But it is not only a touchstone for the trial of *erroneous* belief; it is far more an impenetrable shield against the poisonous darts of *unbelief*. For if the proud sceptic or the ungodly scoffer come to the poor simple child of Christ, and think to crush his faith at a blow by saying,— "Here is what you admit to be bread, what every one knows to be bread, and you tell me it is something else. How can a thing be two things at once? Away with such preposterous notions! The age we live in knows nothing of such superstitions;" the child, as instructed by the Church, will say:—"True, it remains bread as it was before, and every one knows it to be bread; but that is merely 'accidentally,' and in the 'world of sense.' When I say 'It is the Lord's Body,' I mean it is 'substantially' so; and therefore I meet your objection about the impossibility of a thing being two things at once by saying that 'in the invisible, in the supernatural, in the substantial' world, the Holy Ghost, acting at the time the priest consecrates, effects a conversion of the whole substance of the

bread into the substance of the Body of Christ, which conversion I call Transubstantiation.' ”

It may here be well to remove two possible objections to what I have said, which may have been throughout lurking in the minds of my readers as a kind of residuary criticism upon which to fall back at the end.

These two objections might be put in the form of two questions.

I. Does not the Church of Rome, when she says that our Lord is “truly, really, *and substantially*” present, mean by this last word something more than you say she means?

II. Is it after all so utterly impossible to conceive the co-existence of two substances?

I will take these two questions in order, and first state the reasons which appear to make for the objector, and will then add such considerations as occur to me by way of reply.

The objector who puts the first question will say to me:—“Surely this Roman definition I have just quoted is something more than our Church of England doctrine of the Real Objective Presence. For our Church, see, only uses two words, “verily and indeed;” whereas the Church of Rome uses three words, ‘vere, realiter, et substantialiter,’—‘truly, really, and substantially;’ and it seems to me that our two words exactly correspond to the first two of the three Roman

words, and that the third word, 'substantialiter,' is something over and above these two. You have no right, then, to come down upon us in that off-hand manner, and say that because we believe Christ to be 'verily and indeed' present, we also believe Him to be 'verily, indeed,' and *substantially* present. You have no right to say that the Roman formula of Transubstantiation is simply another way of expressing our formula of the Real Objective Presence."

This objection looks at first sight somewhat formidable; but its removal is happily a very simple matter.

It is the principle of the formulæ of most Councils not merely to assert what *is* to be believed, but also to point out at the same time what is *not* to be believed. They do not merely give us a particular form of *truth*, but they also specify that particular form of *error* which is opposed to it; and so it happens in this Council of Trent that we know exactly what the meaning, what the bearing of each definition is,—because side by side with it we have, in the canons, the precise error against which it is a protest. A reference to Canon I. of the Thirteenth Session will shew at once that the word "substantialiter" is opposed to "virtualiter;" and that, therefore, by this word the Church of Rome simply maintains the "Real" Presence, as opposed to the

“Virtual” Presence. With regard to the other two terms she uses, they are both directed against two forms of error which do not even admit of *any* presence at all, “Virtual” or “Real;”—the one being that which regards the Bread and Wine as simply symbols (*signa*) of what is not there; the other that which regards Christ as being only metaphorically (*in figura*) present—present, that is, to the mental eye of the believer who through faith pictures to himself the risen Saviour in heaven. Both these errors deny the Presence in *any* sense, virtual or real, *in the Sacrament*, and they are both equally met by our one word, “verily” present; while our second word, “indeed,”—*i.e.* in “deed,” and not in “power,”—in “fact,” and not in mere “effect,”—is directed against Virtualism, and therefore exactly corresponds with the “*substantialiter*” of the Roman formula.

And here observe what strong proof this gives that that view is right which regards the Roman decree of Transubstantiation as simply a formula to preserve the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence from the charge of contradicting reason;—that it is, in fact, simply a saying what she means by her words when she says that Christ is “*substantially*” and not “*virtually*” present. Surely, then, I have some right to say that this Transubstantiation is a necessary corollary of

our English doctrine too. For if, as seems to be the case, the “substantially” of the Roman formula is equivalent to the “indeed” of the English, then must the Roman decree of Transubstantiation be as much a formula explanatory of the word “indeed” as it is of the word “substantially.”

The second objection, that after all it is possible for two substances to co-exist together, arises entirely from a misuse of language. I cannot better illustrate this than by a quotation from a little book of deserved popularity among us, *viz.* “Thoughts on Low Masses,” by the Rev. Edward Stuart, Perpetual Curate of S. Mary Magdalene, Munster Square.

On page 41 of this book Mr. Stuart thus writes :—

“I think it is abundantly plain that the denial of Transubstantiation no more involves a denial of the Real Presence than an assertion of our Lord’s real humanity involves a denial of His real divinity. To say that our Lord is really man does not hinder our saying that He is also really God ; and to say that the natural substance of bread and wine remains after consecration, does not hinder our saying also that Christ is really, truly, and substantially present in the Sacrament.” . . . . “Transubstantiation

is a certain definition of the mode\* of our Lord's presence in the Sacrament, which the Church of England has repudiated, because it denies the continued existence, after consecration, of the natural substance of bread and wine." . . .

"It is not the presence of the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ, but it is the absence of the substance of bread and wine against which we protest; *unless, indeed, it could be shewn that two substances cannot possibly co-exist together, and this cannot be done as long as the Athanasian creed continues to teach us that our Lord is 'God, of the substance of the Father begotten before the worlds; and man, of the substance of His Mother born in the world,—one, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of Person.'* There were heretics in the early ages of the Church who maintained that our Lord was not really man,—that His manhood was lost and swallowed up in His Godhead, and that He retained only the appearance of man; and this would seem to be a parallel case to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which says that the Sacra-

---

\* Mr. Stuart, if he really is alluding to the Church of Rome here, will pardon my observing that she distinctly declares a "definition of the mode of our Lord's Presence" to be impossible; and also that she never has denied "the existence, after consecration, of what Mr. Stuart calls the '*natural*' substance of bread and wine." That is a gloss upon her terminology which she would decline to accept.

ment is not truly\* bread and wine, that the natural substances (*sic*) of bread and wine are lost and swallowed up in the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ, and that it is only the appearance of bread and wine which remains."

The passages above quoted seem to me to indicate that Mr. Stuart has been using the word "substance" in the same loose, unphilosophical manner in which, as I shall hope to prove presently, it is employed in the formulæ of our Church; although at the same time the last passage of all seems to shew that he is not really aware of this, but unconsciously uses the same word in two wholly different senses. That he really *means*, however, to use it in the loose, and not in the strict sense of the word, is clear from the comparison he draws between it and the Hypostatic Union, which is really no parallel at all, if the word be used in its strict meaning. For "substance" in the case of things does not correspond with the same word "substance" in

---

\* Here again Mr. Stuart, by not quoting exactly, unintentionally misrepresents the Church of Rome—that is to say, if it is of her he means to speak. The Church of Rome does not use "*vere*" and "*substantialiter*" as convertible terms. She would say that the existence of a thing was "*true*," so long as it *was* "*accidentally*" what it seemed to be; for then it is "*true*" to the laws of the world of sense, and does not play "*false*" with our organs of sense. But the "*substantial*" existence of a thing is quite another matter.

the case to which he compares it, but with the word "person." Mr. Stuart has here allowed his ear\* to rule his mind; the similarity of sound has prevented his discerning the dissimilarity of sense, and perceiving that the cases, though *tautologous*, are not *analogous*. For in the case of things it is "accidents" and not "substance" which is the counterpart of the same word "substance" in the case of the Incarnation. For "substance" is to a thing exactly what "personality" is to a person. The "substance" of the thing is the IT, just as the "person" of the man is the HE. And in this sense of the word "substance," two "substances" cannot possibly exist together in one thing, any more than two "personalities" can exist together in one person.† And therefore when Mr. Stuart, quoting as he does the Roman formula, states that our "Lord is really, truly, and *substantially* present" in the Sacrament, he necessarily asserts with the Roman formula that the bread, although in other senses present, is *substantially* absent. For in the strict sense of the word to assert that there are two substances

---

\* His ear might however have done him good service, and led him on the right tack, if it had only suggested that passage of the Athanasian Creed in which the Substance of the Holy and Undivided Trinity is spoken of, instead of that one which he has taken for his comparison.

† See further on this subject, Appendix, Note B.





in the holy Eucharist would be (to adopt Mr. Stuart's own source of illustration) exactly analogous to *denying* the "unity of the person" in the Incarnation, or to "*dividing* the substance" of the blessed and undivided Trinity.

I take another passage from the pen of one whom all believers in the "Real Objective Presence" honour and admire for his bold defence of that cardinal doctrine of our faith, as well as of the ritual that symbolises it—I mean the incumbent of S. Alban's, Holborn. In his Address to his Parishioners, published at the opening of this year, there occurs the following passage (p. 11):—

"I believe that the elements of bread and wine remain in their own natural, material substance; yet that they are 'after consecration not that which nature formed, but that which the benediction has consecrated, and by consecration changed'\* (Andrewes). 'God made man of the dust of the earth.' Here we have the senseless, lifeless form. 'God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man be-

---

\* I suppose this is a rough version of that very passage of S. Augustine which is quoted in Q. xxxiv. (xxxix. in some editions) of the *Catechismus Romanus*, as the explanation of the change implied in Transubstantiation, "Fatemur ante consecrationem panem esse et vinum, quod natura formavit: post consecrationem vero, carnem Christi et sanguinem, quod benedictio consecravit."

came a living soul.' He did not cease to be what he was before—dust of the earth—but he became what he was not before—a living soul. So in the Eucharist, God made bread and wine of the dust of the earth. God the Holy Ghost breathes over it in the act of consecration. It does not cease to be what it was before, but it becomes what it was not before—the life-giving Body and Blood of Christ."

The first sentence of this passage opens with a suspicious indication of the truth of my criticism, that the objection I allude to arises from a misuse of language. For, observe, in strict language, in the language of philosophy and of the Roman formula, "substance" always stands alone. It is a word which conveys its own meaning at once, and any addition to it simply obscures instead of elucidating its meaning. Such additions generally involve a contradiction; and so it is here. For "substance" is something supernatural, not "natural,"—hyper-physical, not physical. It is beyond the reach of the senses; it defies all analysis; we never in the "natural, material" order of things arrive at anything beyond its properties. It is that mysterious, impenetrable, inexplicable essence through and in which, as we believe, God the Holy Ghost, the Lord and giver of life (in its broadest sense, animate and inanimate)

is ever working, under all the various changes of form, shape, colour, &c., which in their ceaseless transmutations constitute the natural world in which we live. The whole creation is in this sense one great Sacrament—one vast outward and visible sign of an inward and invisible grace. And writing as I am on the day on which the Church commemorates this chief of Sacraments, which we are now discussing, I need hardly remind my Catholic readers how the services for Corpus Christi, with their fourfold benediction of nature towards the four corners of the earth, are designed to set forth this sublime truth. The Church seems, as I say, to inculcate this truth upon her children, in that she to-day associates this *hidden* sacramentality of nature with that one highest mystery of our faith, in which we have *revealed* to us in all the plenitude of divine operation the adorable wonders of sacramental power.\* In these days, when so many of our noblest and most earnest thinkers are shutting themselves up within the charmed circle of the sensible, material world—

“Closed in the four walls of a hollow tower,”

we cannot too thankfully welcome all those in-

---

\* This same great truth is also inculcated by the Catholic custom of the priest's recitation of the Song of the Three Children as part of his private office after celebrating.

vitations which Catholic doctrine gives us to escape from this charm,

“And hear the voices talk behind the wall,”

and regard all that we see and feel around us as instinct with a higher life than that which is immediately presented to sense. Let us, then, look beyond the natural to the supernatural,—beyond the visible to the invisible,—beyond the material to the spiritual,—beyond the accidents, in fact, to the substance. A Christian is a traitor to his creed so long as he is content with mere sense-knowledge, and with the mere demonstrations of reason. For has he not been told that “faith,” not reason, “is the victory that overcometh the world,” and that “faith is the evidence,—not of things which are seen, but—“of things which are not seen?” How nobly and grandly sang the poetess of our day\* of—

“The truth which draws  
Through all things upwards; that a twofold world  
Must go to a perfect cosmos. Natural things  
And spiritual,—who separates these two  
In art, in morals, or the social drift,  
Tears up the bond of nature and brings death.

\* \* \* \* \*  
For in this twofold sphere the twofold man  
Holds firmly by the natural, to reach

---

\* Mrs. Browning. “Aurora Leigh,” pp. 302, sq.

The spiritual beyond it,—fixes still  
 The type with mortal vision, to pierce through  
 With eyes immortal, to the antitype  
 Some call the ideal,—better call the real,  
 And certain to be called so presently  
 When things shall have their names.

\* \* \* \*

Yes,—man, the twofold creature, apprehends  
 The twofold manner, in and outwardly,  
 And nothing in the world comes single to him,  
 A mere itself,—cup, column, or candlestick,  
 All patterns of what shall be in the Mount.

\* \* \* \*

No lily-muffled hum of a summer-bee,  
 But finds some coupling with the spinning stars ;  
 No pebble at your foot, but proves a sphere ;  
 No chaffinch, but implies the cherubim :  
 And,—glancing on my own thin, veined wrist,—  
 In such a little tremour of the blood  
 The whole strong clamour of a vehement soul  
 Doth utter itself distinct. *Earth's crammed with heaven,  
 And every common bush afire with God :*  
 But only he who sees, takes off his shoes ;  
 The rest sit round it, and pluck blackberries  
 And daub their natural faces unaware  
 More and more, from the first similitude.

\* \* \* \*

If this world's show were all,  
 Then imitation would be all in Art.

\* \* \* \*

But we stand here, we,  
 If genuine artists, witnessing for God's  
 Complete, consummate, undivided work :—  
*That not a natural flower can grow on earth,  
 Without a flower upon the spiritual side,  
 Substantial, archetypal.*

Thus is Art  
Self-magnified in magnifying a truth  
Which, fully recognised, would change the world  
And shift its morals. If a man could feel,  
Not one day, in the artist's ecstasy,  
But every day, feast, fast, or working-day,  
*The spiritual significance burn through*  
*The hieroglyphic of material shows,*  
Henceforward he would paint the globe with wings,  
And reverence fish and fowl, the bull, the tree,  
And even his very body as a man,—  
Which now he counts so vile."

A noble testimony this to the truth and grandeur of sacramental doctrine ! Burning words, which we should brand in fiery letters upon every page of our theology. For it is, alas ! too true, that the denial of the Real Objective Presence, in these latter days, arises far more often from a materialistic clinging to sense as the sole province of man's every intellectual act, than from any so-called dread of an ignorant and superstitious abuse of the truth ; it is far more often a mark of that tyranny of the understanding which rationalises the soul, than of any so-called reaction against a faith which had degenerated into credulity.

It is this narrowness of intellectual view, too, which is the secret of that lifelessness which seems to characterise most of the exegetical writings of our age. For without a recognition of this sacramentality of nature—as the most

eloquent preacher of this century has so ably shewn\*—it is impossible to apprehend the force of our Lord's parabolic teaching; and still less is it possible to perceive the true extent and meaning of His miracles. A parable is indeed a *spoken*—a miracle an *acted* Sacrament; and the grandest of all miracles is that which God daily performs on our altars, when, beyond and behind, as it were, the accidents of the commonest of those *natural* creatures which He has provided for the *bodily* sustenance of the *natural* man, He supplies, by His Word uttered by His priest, His own Incarnate Substance,—Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity,—as a *super-natural* provision, to be the *spiritual* food of the *sacramental* man.

“What *sign* shewest thou, then, that we may see and believe thee? What dost thou *work*?” †

Jesus said unto them, “I am the Bread of Life.”

This, then, is at once the great object of our faith, as well as the miraculous evidence of it—namely, the Presence of the Incarnate God under the form of Bread upon our altars.

---

\* Edward Irving. Introductory lecture on the Parable of the Sower. Collected Works, vol. i. pp. 72-82. The whole series of these lectures is earnestly recommended to the perusal of all those who wish to realise the full significance of our Divine Master's teaching.

+ John vi. 30-35.

It was an evidence which it came not within the narrow scope of the Judaism of that day to receive. "The Jews then murmured at Him, because He said, I am the Bread which came down from heaven."\* They appealed to reason and sense. "Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know?" It is also an evidence which it comes not within the narrow scope of the materialism of the present day to receive. They too murmur when we say that "the Bread of God is He which cometh down from heaven;"† they, too, appeal to reason and sense, and say "Is not this Bread, the taste, the smell, the appearance of which we know?" as if this were the sum total of the whole matter. Yes, it is an evidence "hidden indeed from the wise and prudent, but revealed unto babes." (The Lord be praised that He has revealed it unto those to whom He has revealed it!) And it is, moreover, no mere piece of speculative evidence; this miracle, this sign by which we assert the divinity of our faith, is at the same time the centre of our whole *practical* life; it is the highest *work* of Christianity, whether in the Church or in the individual. For when "they said unto Him: What shall we do, that we might work the works of God? Jesus answered and said unto

---

\* Verses 41, 42.

† Verse 33.



them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent.”\* “As the living Father sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me.”†

But to return, at last, to our quotation from the Pastoral Letter. It seems to me that either these words, “own natural material substance,” are simply equivalent to “accidents,” or else they are a contradiction in terms. And that the former is the case seems probable from the quotation‡ from Bishop Andrewes immediately following, which is to my mind nothing short of an assertion of Transubstantiation. For if, as these words imply, there *be* a change, that change must be either an “accidental” or a “substantial” one; and of course no one would accuse Bishop Andrewes of maintaining a change of the “accidents” of the Bread and Wine. The illustration, too, which follows seems to bear out my criticism; for the very words “God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life” imply such a change as has been described. The “substance” which was previously of such a nature as to present to us that class of accidental transmutations in the world of sense to which we give the name “inanimate,” is changed into a “substance” presenting us with that

---

\* John vi. 28, 29.

† Verse 57.

‡ On this quotation see note, p. 80.

class of transmutations &c., to which we give the name "animate." It would be a contradiction in terms to say that a thing can *be* both an "animate" and an "inanimate" thing at once; yet to this are we reduced, unless the words quoted imply this change.

No doubt we deal with a mystery; yet with one of which every child's instinct has the key. We philosophise, and use words hard to be understood, but still we proclaim a truth which is evident to the very simplest. A thing cannot *be* two things at once. It may *look* like one thing and be another, may *taste* like one thing and be another, may *feel* like one thing and be another. These, however, are all the "accidents" of a thing, not its "substance." True, for *all ordinary intents and purposes*, in the loose and general sense of the word "is," we say a thing *is* what it seems, feels, tastes to be; and it is, therefore, no wonder that in an unphilosophical language like our own we should use such expressions as "very natural substances," and "Transubstantiation," in the sense in which I hope presently to prove that our formulæ do use them. But here we are dealing with no ordinary subject, and we ought therefore to use strict language with respect to it; and in the strict sense of the word, to maintain the co-existence of two substances is to

contradict reason. And though faith is superior to reason, and teaches us things which cannot be made *demonstrable* to reason, she never teaches us that which is *contradictory* of it. The objects of faith may be inconceivable, inexpressible, inexplicable ; but they can never be, in the strict sense of the word, irrational.

Having thus endeavoured to explain the Roman decree of Transubstantiation in its relation to the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, and subsequently to remove two possible objections to the acceptance of this explanation, I will now ask my readers to bear with me once more whilst I again attempt to put the whole matter in a simple and practical light.

Take any young lad of average intelligence. Instruct him by any process you please in the doctrine of the "Real Objective Presence." Then ask him respecting the consecrated elements, *not* what they *look* like—not what they *taste* like—not even what they *are*, *as an outward part or sign*. But ask him simply and plainly "What ARE they? What have they BECOME?" What now will be his answer?

If, despite all your instruction, he still remain a Symbolist, he will say:—"They are, they have become, the *symbols* of the Body and Blood of our Lord."

If again, despite all your instruction, he still remain a Virtualist, he will say :—" They have become, as it were, channels of the virtues and graces of Christ to those that receive them as such in repentance and faith."

If again, despite all your instruction, he still remain a mere Realist, he will say :—" They have been so changed, that on an act of due participation, and in virtue of that act, they will become the Body and Blood of our Lord."

But if he be true to your instructions, he will give your plain question "What ARE they? What have they BECOME?" a plain honest answer :—" They ARE, they have BECOME, the BODY and BLOOD of the LORD." And in this answer he will have proclaimed the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation as the necessary, inevitable corollary of that doctrine of the Real Objective Presence which you have taught him. For the Church of Rome adds nothing new here. It is no "over-defining." She says nothing of the *manner* of this conversion ; nothing of the character or duration\* of

---

\* As far as I am aware the Church of Rome has never considered it necessary to define how long the Sacramental Presence remains in the consecrated elements. Her prevalent practical belief, however, is that as our Lord simply spoke of the Presence in connection with bread and wine, the Presence remains only so long as the consecrated elements continue, in all their sensible and nutritive pro-

its effects. She simply puts into the *mouth* of the faithful, that which every one of them says in his *mind*, directly he conceives the idea of the Real Objective Presence, and provides them with a formula by which to “try the spirits” of error, as well as repel the sneers of cynicism and the taunts of unbelief.

“Ah!”—I fancy I hear some of my readers say—“it is all very well attempting to whitewash the Church of Rome like that. But what then mean all the protests in our formulæ against a ‘natural’ Presence of Christ in the Eucharist? Surely they *must* refer to some Roman doctrine. So before you go on to try and prove, as you promise to do, that when our Church uses *one* big-sounding, philosophical, and dogmatic word like ‘Transubstantiation,’ she really means to use that *other* newfangled word of yours, ‘Transaccidentation,’ I should like to be clearly convinced that the Church of Rome does not mean ‘Transaccidentation’ too. For I have always thought she *did* mean something of the kind. I have always been told that she believes the consecrated bread to be a carnal, corporeal Pre-

---

perties, proper bread and wine; and that therefore in the case of any such decay and corruption as would render them, in the ordinary sense of the words, unfit for food, we have no warrant for believing in the continuance of the Sacramental Presence.

sence of Christ's 'natural' flesh, and the consecrated wine a sensible, material presence of Christ's 'natural' blood, and that on this very account she refuses to administer the cup to her laity, for fear of accidents with it."

Now an objector of *this* kind will not be satisfied with *my* plain denial of his charge against the Church of Rome. He will not even be satisfied with a denial given in the unmis-takeable language of the Council of Trent. No! I say, he will not. And as this irrational, this monstrous, this cruel belief is, strange to say, very prevalent among us; as it has been handed down from generation to generation, and accepted with the same amount of unhesitating, unreflecting credulity by rich and poor, learned and ignorant, clergy and laity, alike,—I am not Quixotic enough to suppose that such a belief, however gross and culpable an anachronism in an age of inquiry like the present, can be eradicated by a mere denial, or exorcised by a single quotation. No! I must detain my readers longer on this subject.

But before I prove that the Church of Rome does *not* hold "Transaccidentation," nor a "natural" Presence of Christ, I must first clear the way by stating what is meant by a "spiritual" as opposed to a "natural" Presence; for on this subject there are many erroneous impressions

abroad, which necessitate an explanation of these terms before I dare to use them.

In the first part of this Essay I introduced the Church as sitting in judgment upon the Virtualist, and as pointing out to him his misapprehension with regard to the use of the word "spiritual" in her formulæ. At the present day the common use of this word connects it at once with the personal dispositions of the "believer." We talk, for instance, of a "spiritually"-minded man, meaning thereby a man of faith and piety. Some of us are fond of quoting a certain text—"God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him, must worship Him in spirit and in truth"—(I do not now say rightly or wrongly)—as if "spiritual" worship meant something in which outward act and form had no share, but which was simply a direct, emotional converse between the soul and its Maker. And so too we have come, many of us, to talk about Christ being "spiritually" present in the Eucharist, as if it meant that He was not actually there, but that "faith" in some metaphorical, figurative, and indefinable act of its own, realised Him as there; as if, to use a favourite expression, "Christ was present in the heart of the believer." This then being the current use of the word, and its too common application to the Holy Eucharist, we, who

believe in the "Real Objective Presence," cannot be too careful, when we state it to be a "spiritual" Presence, to guard against our words being taken in this modern and "subjective" sense, and being thus made the source of error. It is one of the most dangerous and subtle devices of the spirit of error, that he adopts well-known terms which have been used in the cause of truth, associates them in men's minds with certain erroneous ideas, and thereby makes the incautious advocate of truth, who uses the words in their original sense, the unwitting disseminator of error.

We have seen that our Church holds the "doctrine of the Real Objective Presence," and repudiates all other forms of belief which fall short of it. We have also seen that we have no right to put upon isolated words and expressions in the Liturgy or Articles a sense which brings them into antagonism with that interpretation of them which the Church gave us fifty years later. Now, to attach to the word "spiritual" in our formularies any such sense as would imply a metaphorical or virtual Presence in the Eucharist, as distinct from a real Presence, would be to assert this right, and to set up a system of private interpretation at variance with that which the Church has given us, and which we, as loyal members of the Church, are bound, at all



hazards, to accept. It is therefore plain that the following expressions in the Liturgy—

“To be our *spiritual* food and sustenance in that holy Sacrament ;”

“For then we *spiritually* eat the flesh of Christ, and drink His Blood ;”

“For that Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us . . with the *spiritual* food of the most precious Body and Blood of Christ ;”

and the following in the Twenty-eighth Article :

“The Body of Christ is given . . . only after an ‘*heavenly and spiritual*’ manner ;”

*cannot* bear that meaning, which, it would be no exaggeration to say, fully two-thirds of the members of our Church attach to them.

No, they mean something else ; they can have no “ subjective ” meaning—they cannot refer to “ faith,” “ emotions,” “ imaginations,” “ pious ecstasies of the soul,” or anything of the kind. The Presence is “ real ” and “ objective,” and therefore the word “ spiritual ” has a *real* and *objective* meaning : it refers to something determinately *there*—to something definitely existing in the world without us. Let us see if we can find a clue to the meaning of the word elsewhere in the Prayer-Book.

If we turn to the lesson appointed for the office of the Burial of the Dead we shall find

exactly what we want. Our English translation makes S. Paul speak there of a "spiritual" body, as opposed to a "natural" body. He also says: "The first man was of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven;" or, as he afterwards says, the "heavenly" man. Here, then, we have the two words "spiritual" and "heavenly," which our Article uses, and in an application, too, analogous to that which is there made of them. We can, therefore, by an examination of this passage, approximate to their true meaning.

First be it observed, that "spiritual" is *not* opposed to "bodily," for here a "spiritual *body*" is spoken of. Neither can "heavenly" bear that subjective meaning in which we talk of "heavenly" thoughts, "heavenly" hopes, a "heavenly" frame of mind, &c. &c. No, it *must* mean something real and definite, for it is an actual, concrete, objective existence that is spoken of, "the heavenly *man*," or "the *man from heaven*." Now, as it is plain that "spiritual" here is opposed to "natural," we may for convenience sake, to avoid misconception, substitute for it the word "supernatural;" and as it is plain that the word "heavenly" is opposed to "earthy," and as the same word a few verses before is translated "celestial," as opposed to "terrestrial," we may also, for convenience sake,

and to avoid misconception, substitute this word "celestial" for it.

Now let us, for the moment, suppose this substitution to have been made in our formularies, and let us see how they sound, and what effect they produce upon the mind.

"The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten only after a *supernatural* and *celestial* manner."

"For that Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us with the *supernatural* food of the most precious Body and Blood of Christ."

Will any Symbolist, will any Virtualist, be able to base his subjective theories on such formulæ as these? No.

Do they, on the other hand, fit in with the doctrine of the "Real Objective Presence?" Yes.

And as this, not the other theories, is what our Church holds, so we may be pretty sure we have now found the true sense in which she uses these words "spiritual" and "heavenly."

Hitherto we have only made the Church assert the *fact* of Christ's Presence—here, however, we have her negative definition of the manner or mode of that Presence.

It is not a "natural" Presence, but a "supernatural;" it is not a presence after the manner of "terrestrial" bodies, *i.e.* bodies in the world

of sense around us, but after the manner of "celestial" bodies.

Now, the laws of natural presences we know; we can trace them in the fulfilment of definite conditions of localisation, extension, visibility, and divisibility. To these laws our Lord's "natural" Body conforms. But here we have not His "natural" but His "supernatural" Body present, which rises superior to these laws. No doubt this "celestial" Body also conforms to certain laws, but of the nature of *these* laws we know nothing, save that they are *not* the laws to which terrestrial bodies conform.

All, then, that our Church tells us of Christ's Presence beyond the fact of it, is *negative*. It tells us the laws to which it does *not* conform—not those to which it *does*. It cannot be localised; it is not seen; it is not touched; it cannot be divided. All these are conditions to which a "natural" body conforms; but here we have a "spiritual" or "supernatural" Body. Our Church tells us nothing *positive* of the laws, the manner, the mode of this "spiritual" Presence. All these are beyond the highest flights of imagination, beyond the most comprehensive grasp of thought; they are like the "substance" of which we spoke before—they evade the keenest and most daring penetration—they baffle the subtlest and most persistent analysis. It is faith which

here asserts that which reason cannot demonstrate, yet need not contradict. It is faith which here conceives that which thought cannot shape, nor speech express, and yet which neither need deny.

Having thus explained what is meant by a “spiritual” and “heavenly” presence, I shall now endeavour to shew:—

- I. That the Church of Rome *does* maintain the Real Objective Presence to be a “spiritual” and “heavenly” Presence.
- II. That she does *not* believe it to be a “natural” and “earthly” Presence; and
- III. That she does *not* hold the doctrine of Transubstantiation in the sense of Transaccidentation.

The first two propositions being strictly *correlative*, we shall often find one and the same statement giving the proof of both, so that we will take them together. In proof of them I will first quote chap i. of the Thirteenth Session of the Council of Trent:—

“Nor is there anything self-contradictory in saying, on the one hand, that our Saviour Himself sitteth ever at the right hand of the Father in Heaven, according to His *natural* mode of existence; and yet, on the other, that in many other places He is *sacramentally* present for us

in His substance,\* after *that* mode of existence, which, although we cannot express it in words, yet by the light of faith we can conceive, yea, and ought firmly to maintain, to be possible with God."

Can anything be plainer than that the Church of Rome here distinguishes between the "natural" and the "spiritual," or, as she calls it, the "sacramental" mode of Christ's Presence, and maintains with us that "Christ's natural Body is in Heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one;" whereas she holds that this is possible with the "spiritual" body, although we cannot express the *mode* of its existence—i. e. the laws to which it conforms.

Here therefore she distinctly repudiates the "natural" Presence, and distinctly affirms the "spiritual" Presence.

In chap. ii. of the same Session, the Church of Rome tells us:—

"Christ desired the Sacrament to be received as the spiritual food of souls" (*spiritualem animarum cibum.*)

This again exactly corresponds with our expressions "spiritual food and sustenance," &c.,

---

\* This phrase, as I have already explained above, means His "real" as opposed to "virtual" Presence,—*substantialiter*, as opposed to *in virtute*.

&c. It is, therefore, a “spiritual,” and not a “natural” Body, of which, according to the Church of Rome, we partake; and therefore it is a “spiritual, and not a “natural” Body, which is there present.

In chap. iii. of the same Session the Church of Rome tells us:—

“It has ever been believed by God’s Church that directly after consecration the true Body of our Lord and His true Blood are present, together with His Soul and Divinity, under the form of Bread and Wine; but that His Body is there under the form of Bread, and His Blood under the form of Wine, in virtue of the words\* of consecration. Howbeit that very Body is present under the form of Wine, and the Blood under the form of Bread, and the Soul under both, in virtue of that natural bond and union by which the parts of Christ our Lord who rose from the dead to die no more are indissolubly held together. His divinity is also there on

---

\* This distinction between the *vi verborum* (or *vi ipsius Sacramenti*) and the *vi Concomitantiae* means this (vide *Catechismus Romanus*, Q. xxviii.): that although Christ Himself, Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity, is wholly present under the form of Bread, still it is the Presence of His Body *only* which we are warranted in attributing to the act of consecration, because that is all which the appointed words assert. The rest is present because the Body Itself is there: for where the Body is there *must* the rest be, in virtue of the indissoluble union existing between them.

account of the wonderful hypostatic union of it with His Body and Soul. Wherefore it is most true, that the same is contained under either form as under both. For Christ, whole and complete, is present under the form of Bread, and under every particle of that form; and Christ, whole and complete, is present under the form of Wine, and under every particle of that form."

Now, have we, I ask, in the whole range of our Liturgy, Articles, and Catechism, any more emphatic declaration of a wholly supernatural, transcendental, celestial Presence, or any more emphatic disclaimer of a natural, sensible, corporeal Presence, than this?

"What!"—you will exclaim,—“here have I been taught to believe from childhood upwards, that the Church of Rome held the Wine in the cup to be Blood, in that very same sense, in which we hold it to be wine,—Blood, that is, after the same natural mode of existence as if the Cup were filled with the drops direct from the wounded Body itself. And here, I am told, that this Wine—a liquid and not a solid substance—is the Body, in the same sense as it is the Blood; and the Bread—a solid and not a liquid substance—is the Blood, in the same sense as it is the Body; and further, that this Wine is Body and Blood, yea, Soul and Divinity, of the Lord. And not only this, but that in each infinitesimal



crumb of the Bread, and in each minutest drop of the Wine, the Lord and Maker of all things, the Risen Saviour, is, Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity, wholly present ! Is this the exalted, the majestic, the glorious belief of a Church whose doctrines I have hitherto regarded as those of a gross, carnal, sensuous materialism ? Are these the pure heights of faith to which *that* Church soars which I have always denounced as grovelling in the darkest depths of superstition, and trafficking in meretricious trickeries and deceptions of the sense ? These notions of her idolatries and witchcraft, of her earthly and corporeal degradation, I have sucked in with my mother's milk ; they have grown with me in every fibre of my frame ; they have coursed with the blood through every vein of my body. Are they then all a dream ? and do I now awake to find myself face to face with a form of belief in which all is so high, all so heavenly, all so far removed beyond all experience of sense, all conception of thought, and all demonstration of reason, that even the eye of faith herself is dazzled by the unwonted purity of that light, and she can only veil her face with cherubic wing, as she stands paralysed in the presence of a truth so grand, so sublime, so radiant with the glory of the City of God ?”

Ah ! my reader, it is very sad to think how

many good men and true have lived and died in England in the firm conviction that millions of their fellowmen maintained a belief so utterly, so absolutely, so unmistakeably at variance with what they did maintain as this. And sadder still it is to think that now, when at last our Church is beginning to teach her members the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, so many in positions of authority and influence, Archbishops and Bishops, Deans and Archdeacons, should be hindering the advance of truth by their constant disclaimers against a "carnal" view, and "Roman" error, and their timorous, faint-hearted cautions against calling things by their right names for fear of misconception—*just as if* this "carnal" view *were* the teaching of the Church of Rome. How can we continue to be so un-English and so un-Christian, so false, so disloyal to our own Church,—so cruel, so unjust to the Church of Rome?

I might think that, having thus proved the truth of my two first propositions, I could leave the third to take care of itself: but I know how hard it is to remove a popular prejudice, and will therefore leave no stone unturned to shew how utterly false the common notions of Roman doctrine are.

My third proposition is: that the Church of Rome does not hold "Transaccidentation;" but

that the Bread and Wine still retain their natural properties as before.

Now, I might quote you sentence after sentence to prove this; but I know that one *fact* is worth a hundred formulæ; and there is one *fact* in the usage of the Church of Rome which will at once prove my point to you. Strange to say, it is that very practice which you appeal to as your excuse for believing that the Church of Rome *does* maintain Transaccidentation—*viz.* what is called, though incorrectly, her “refusal of the cup to the laity.”\*

I will simply give you a few of the authoritative reasons for this usage, as I find them in the ordinary English edition (Dr. Challoner's) of Pius IV.'s “Grounds of the Catholic Doctrine:”—

“1. Because, considering how soon wine decays, the Sacrament could not well be kept for the sick in both kinds.

“2. Because some constitutions can neither endure the taste or smell of wine.

“3. Because true wine in some countries is hard to be met with.”

Now, whatever, my reader, may be your view of the practical value of these objections, you

---

\* For further remarks on this subject see note C at the end of the Essay.

must admit that they furnish at once the most clear and convincing proof that the Bread and Wine, whatever other change may pass over them at the time of Consecration, *do* remain in all their accidents (and these, be it remembered, are all we knew of them before, besides their existence) real Bread and Wine. They are seen as such, touched as such, tasted as such, affect the bodily organism as such—nay, decay and turn to corruption as such.

What further proof can you need after this, that the Church of Rome admits no shade or vestige of Transaccidentation? How remarkable it is that this very diversity of practice between the two Churches should be the providential means of establishing beyond a doubt their identity of faith!

It is now time that we paused and took a brief review of our present position. What we have endeavoured to prove may be briefly summed up thus :—

I. That the Church of England, as speaking with final authority in her Catechism, maintains the doctrine of the “Real Objective Presence,” and rejects every other doctrine short of it.

II. That the Church of Rome, as speaking with final authority in her Council of Trent, also maintains this same doctrine of the “Real

Objective Presence," and rejects every other doctrine short of it.

III. That the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation is simply an assertion in another form of this same doctrine of the "Real Objective Presence," and is no further development of that doctrine; and that

IV. Therefore, as the Church of England holds the doctrine of the "Real Objective Presence," she must either hold the doctrine of Transubstantiation as well, or be prepared to cut at the roots of all faith by contradicting reason, and giving the lie to a primary law of the human mind.

That is the whole sum and substance of what we have endeavoured to prove. Incidentally, however, we have also shewn:—

I. That the words "spiritual" and "heavenly," as applied to the Eucharistic Presence, have definitely *objective* meanings, being opposed the one to "natural," the other to "earthly," or we might say "carnal."

II. That the Church of England maintains this "Real Objective Presence" to be, in this sense, a "spiritual" and "heavenly,"—not a "natural" and "carnal" Presence.

III. That the Church of Rome, in still stronger and more emphatic language, also maintains precisely the same thing.

And, finally, in order to help in removing a gross but very prevalent misconception, we proved,—

IV. That the Church of Rome does not hold Transaccidentation.

We might have thought that enough had now been said to prove the thorough and complete unanimity of the two Churches on this most important subject. There still remains, however, what will prove a very serious obstacle to conviction in the minds of many, until removed, and that is, the protests existing in our Liturgy and Articles against a doctrine bearing this same name, Transubstantiation. And therefore it is that I shall now endeavour to prove that we use the word in a different sense to that in which the Church of Rome uses it; that it is not *Transubstantiation*, against which we protest, but *Transaccidentation*. And if I can prove this, then you must admit that the unanimity of the two Churches is complete, for I have already shewn that the Church of Rome does *not* hold Transaccidentation, and therefore it cannot be against her that our Church protests.

Now I might content myself with the same line of argument I adopted before, in rejecting the meaning commonly assigned to the two words “spiritual” and “heavenly;” and I might say: “I have proved to you that our Church,

speaking with final authority in her Catechism, asserts the 'Real Objective Presence,' of which I have also proved the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation to be only another form; and, therefore, as we have no right to give a word in the Liturgy or Articles such a meaning as makes it contradict the Catechism, the word *cannot* in our Article mean 'Transubstantiation,' but must mean something different."

But this, I know, will not be enough for you; and so, besides proving what the word does *not* mean, I must also try and shew you what it *does* mean.

Let me first quote to you the formularies in question:—

"No adoration is intended or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine there bodily received, or unto any corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, . . . . and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one."—  
(*Rubric at end of Liturgy.*)

"Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is

repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and has given occasion to many superstitions.

“The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner.”—(Article xxviii.)

Now, what I want to prove is that in the one case the words “very natural substances” really mean “very natural properties”—*i. e.* “accidents;” and in the other, that the word “Transubstantiation” really means “Transaccidentation.” I will begin with proofs probable first, and will go on to proofs positive afterwards. To begin with the Rubric:—

First, I would repeat what I remarked before, that “substance,” in its strict sense, is a word always used alone, and never qualified; and that for the very simple reason that we know nothing whatever about *its conditions*, and can therefore apply no epithets to it save negative ones, to denote what it is not. Whenever, therefore, the word “substance” has any positive epithets attached to it, it is always a suspicious indication that the word is not used correctly. Here we have two such words, “very” and “natural,” and the second of these two amounts, to my mind, very nearly to proof positive that my suspicions are correct. For “substance” is not “natural,” but “supernatural.” What we



mean by the “natural” world is the “world of sense”—the world which we see and feel around us; and that is the world of “accidents.” But “substance,” although *necessary* to this “natural” world, to this world of sense, is no part of it; we do not see it and do not feel it; it belongs to the world *beyond sense*—to the “supernatural” world; and of its “*nature*” we know nothing.

I cannot either pass by unnoticed—although to many it may appear a piece of hypercriticism—that the word used here is the plural, “substances:” whereas the word, when used in its strict sense, stands generally in the singular only, “substance.” We do not, for instance, in the Athanasian Creed say, “by confusion of substances,” but “by confusion of substance.” And so again the Church of Rome, in her Second Canon, does not talk, as we do here, of the “substances” of Bread and Wine, but of “the substance of the Bread and the Wine.”

Next, observe the context of this expression. It stands in close connection with a certain word denoting the manner in which the consecrated elements are received. There is an obvious stress upon the word the “sacramental Bread and Wine there ‘*bodily*’ received,” or else why should it be there at all? There is also in intimate connection with it a protest against the

“presence of Christ’s *natural* Body.” Now observe how these words, “very *natural* substances,” “*bodily*” received, “*natural* body,” all have reference to the world of sense, to the world of accidents; and thus they give such a colour and tone to the whole passage, as almost necessitates the belief that it is “Transaccidentation” and not “Transubstantiation” which is alluded to here. For observe, first, that which we *bodily* receive in the Eucharist is not substance but accidents. We have already remarked that the nourishing properties of a thing, its powers of affecting the animal organism, are, so far as we know them, still the accidents of the thing, although we can carry them back a step further by analysis than the surface accidents, so to speak, which are presented to eye, taste, and touch. And it is clear that in this sense, we, equally with the Church of Rome, maintain that the “Bread and Wine remain in their very natural properties,” (as I would suggest “substances” here means). These it is which we “*bodily*” receive; but that which we “*spiritually*” receive is the substance. Again, on the other hand, Christ’s “*natural*” body could not be present without a change of “these very natural properties” of Bread and Wine, and without our “*bodily*” \* re-

---

\* Of course there is a sense in which we *do* “*bodily*” receive IT, but it is not the sense in which we use the word here.

ceiving IT. In this case there must be Transaccidentation. For to have two complete sets of accidents existing together to one substance is as monstrous a contradiction of reason as to have two substances for one set of accidents. So that if the Church of England wished to protest against a "carnal" Presence, she could not do it more thoroughly than by denying the "Transaccidentation" of the elements, as well as the "accidental," *i.e.* the "natural," Presence of Christ's Body. And this is exactly what she seems to me to have done.

There is then, as I say, strong proof presumptive from the context that the Church is here protesting against Transaccidentation, and that she uses the words "very natural substances" in a loose kind of way, really equivalent to "real natural properties."

I have already remarked that in general we use this word "substance" in such a vague, promiscuous kind of manner, that there is *no strong à priori improbability* in its being so used here, and I have specially pointed out passages from other writers, in which, although this same subject is being treated of with a show of dogmatic exactness, this misuse of the word still occurs. Mr. Stuart's quotation of this expression "very natural substances" in this loose sense, was all the more favourable to

my purpose, because, as I shewed, his misuse of the word was so wholly unconscious. I will just add another passage to prove this same misuse. It is from a book I have already quoted—Carter on the Priesthood, p. 36.

“The act is based on the belief that the inanimate creatures lying on the altar are capable, through God’s power, of being changed from their natural state, and becoming, after some supernatural manner, yet without losing their own true *substance or properties*, the veils and organs of a true substantial Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ.”

Here, then, we have the two words, “substance” and “properties,” treated as synonymous. For, observe, it is not “*and properties*,” but “*or properties*.” The word “properties” is inserted as an *explanation* of the word “substance,” and not as an *addition* to it. We will, however, suppose for the moment that it was meant to be an addition to it, and that the sentence ought to have run “without losing either their own true substance or their own true properties;” *i. e.* let us suppose that substance here really means “substance,” and properties “accidents;” then I would ask, how could we in one clause talk of the elements “being changed from their natural state;” and in the other say “that they are changed neither in substance nor in acci-

dents;" for they *must* be changed in one or the other of these, if they are changed at all?

Let me, then, recapitulate my case with regard to the rubric.

- I. The word is "substances," not "substance."
- II. It has qualifying epithets attached to it, one of which is inapplicable to the strict word "substance."
- III. Other writers have evidently taken it as equivalent to "accidents" or "properties."
- IV. The whole context both before and after—of the "bodily" reception on the one side, and the "natural" Presence on the other,—points to precisely the same idea.

Now let us turn to the Article.

First, I wish to put a plain question to the reader, with regard to the language here used. "Would he, after hearing the explanation of the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation as a simple corollary of the words of Christ Himself, be prepared to say of it, that it is 'repugnant to the plain words of Scripture?'" And again, "Would he, after hearing the third chapter of the Council of Trent, quoted above, say of it, 'that it hath given occasion to many supersti-

tions ?” If not, then he must be prepared to admit personally that the very strength of these expressions is a proof that it was not against the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation that they were levelled. On the other hand, “Would he not be ready to admit the comparative truth of the statement, that ‘Transaccidentation,’ (or the change of the natural properties of Bread and Wine) is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, and hath given rise to many superstitions ?”

Next, at the risk of appearing hypercritical, I must remark that although the word “substance” in the Article is correctly used in the *singular*,—still, the whole expression “substance of Bread and Wine” is incorrect. The formal expression is the “substance of the Bread and the Wine,” and the introduction of the Article at once gives a definite idea to the mind, which it seeks in vain in the looser and more generic expression, “substance of Bread and Wine.” We mean quite another thing, when, for instance, we say “the substance of wool,” “the substance of wood,” “the substance of coal,” &c., to what we should mean when in a dogmatic statement respecting “substance” and “accidents” we said “the substance of *this* ball of wool,” “the substance of *this* piece of wood,” &c., &c. Observe, on the

other hand, how exactly this use in the Article of "the substance of bread and wine" corresponds with the equally loose and general expression in the Rubric, "very natural substances."

I will now pass on to see how the expression in the Article has been interpreted by other writers. Here again I will quote from Mr. Carter on the Priesthood, p. 18 :—

"What the Church of England guarded against in denying Transubstantiation is evident from the words of the Article, 'Transubstantiation (or the *change of the substance* of Bread and Wine).' The Real Objective Presence is left perfectly untouched by these words ; neither is it denied that there is *a change* of the elements, only it is not a change of their *substance*."

Now here I think Mr. Carter must have read the Article in my light, although, like Mr. Stuart, he does not seem to see that he has. For here I must repeat my former remark, that if there be *a change*, it must be either an "accidental" or a "substantial" change ; and therefore to assert that the change is *not* a "substantial" one, is to assert that it is an "accidental" one. Now no one will accuse the Church of England of maintaining an "accidental" change ; and yet to this are we reduced if we suppose her to use the word "substance"

and "Transubstantiation" in their strict sense. It is the old alternative again under a new form. We first had it with regard to the Presence—either a Real Presence, or no Presence at all; now we have it as applied to the correlative idea of the change—either "Transubstantiation," or no change at all.

I now turn to the last book on the Articles by Bishop Forbes. Unfortunately the part in which this Article falls is not yet published. But I find in the preface a most significant passage, in which the opinions of S. Gregory the Great, as founder of the English Church, are being held up in contradistinction to the present opinions of the Roman See, as settled in the Council of Trent or since: (p. xxix.) And amongst other contrasts occurs the following:—

"If we find him (*i. e.* Gregory) strongly asserting the efficacy of the Eucharistic sacrifice, we find no countenance for Transubstantiation; his very public Liturgy recognising the existence of the *munus temporale* in the Sacrament as well as the *cœleste remedium*."

Now, are we not justified in drawing from this passage the following inferences:—

- 1st. That Transubstantiation as used here implies the *removal of the munus temporale*.



- 2nd. That Bishop Forbes holds that the modern Church of Rome sanctions the idea of such removal in her doctrine of Transubstantiation.
- 3rd. That Bishop Forbes is here using the word in the same sense in which he believes it to be used in the Twenty-eighth Article; otherwise, in writing a preface to a book on the Articles, he would have been careful to have told us in *what other* sense he used it.

But we have already seen that :—

- 1st. Transubstantiation in its true sense does *not* imply any such removal. It is Transaccidentation that does that.
- 2nd. That the Church of Rome distinctly maintains the continued existence of the Bread and Wine in all their properties, nutritive included, and so can hold no doctrine implying their removal.

From which two things I conclude :—

- (1) That Bishop Forbes also uses the word here in the sense of Transaccidentation, and that in his opinion this would be the meaning of the word in the Article. Consequently,

- (2) It cannot be against any authorised doctrine of the Church of Rome that our Article is directed.

For another examination of a similar misuse of the word, I refer the reader to the Postscript, p. 145.

Further observe that in the Article, as well as in the Rubric, the question of this “carnal” Presence is brought in, and we are told that Christ is received only after a “spiritual” and “heavenly” manner, as if the doctrine protested against were one which made us “bodily” receive Christ, after a natural and carnal manner—*i. e.* accidentally, and thereby implied a Transaccidentation of the Bread and Wine, so that we could no longer “bodily” receive them, nor describe them as “remaining still in their very natural substances” (*i. e.* properties). Here, again, you will be forced to admit that the whole spirit and intention of the context makes strongly in favour of Transaccidentation; whereas, as we have already remarked, to take “Transubstantiation in its true sense here would be either to make the Article contradict the authorised interpretation of it given in the Catechism, or else to do violence to a universal dictate of reason.”

How then stands our case with regard to the Article?

- I. We have seen that the strong expressions used in it render it almost impossible to suppose any reference to the real doctrine of Transubstantiation.
- II. That the expression itself is too vague and indefinite to have such a reference.
- III. That other writers have in a kind of unconscious way, which is doubly valuable as a piece of evidence, taken the word to be here used for Transaccidentation.
- IV. That here, as in the Rubric, the whole context points to this interpretation.
- V. That any other interpretation introduces a contradiction either of the Church's voice or of the universal voice of man.

Now surely, all these put together, and added to the strong proofs given in the case of the Rubric, make it in the highest degree probable that we are right when we say that "Transubstantiation" in our Twenty-eighth Article really means "Transaccidentation."

Still you may not yet be quite satisfied that the word is so used ; and I wish, if possible, to leave no doubt whatever about it, and therefore I ask further—What else does our Article say about Transubstantiation ? It tells us that "it overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament ;"—and what does our Church tell us is the nature of a

Sacrament ? A Sacrament, she says, must consist of two parts—an “outward sign,” and a “thing signified;”—and, therefore, when the Article says that “Transubstantiation overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament,” it means that it destroys one of these two parts; and of course, we must say, the outward part, or sign. But Transubstantiation in its true sense does *not* do that. The “outward sign” is always spoken of by the Church of Rome as remaining,—aye, and treated and acted upon as remaining. We have seen above (p. 106) that it is “bodily” received as such: the following lines will shew that it is also manually broken as such:—

Nulla rei fit scissura,  
*Signi tantum fit fractura.*

It remains, as we say, in the loose sense, “still in its very natural substance.” Again, from the side of the Presence, the Church of Rome proclaims the same truth of the remanence of the sign; for Christ, she tells us, is present *sacramentally*—*i.e.* as a supernatural Presence under a natural form: and if Christ be thus present sacramentally, how could it be said of Transubstantiation that it “overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament?” It is clearly *impossible*, therefore, that the word can bear this meaning, and have this reference in our Article.

But will it bear the meaning Transaccidentation? Most certainly. For Transaccidentation could “*not* be proved by Holy Writ, and *would* overthrow the nature of a Sacrament.” For if the Bread and Wine became accidentally as well as substantially the Body and Blood of Christ, then should we have *no real outward sign*, but merely a delusive one, giving the lie to our senses, and as we can well believe, “giving rise to many superstitions.” Moreover, then we should not “*bodily*” receive the Sacramental Bread and Wine—they would no longer “remain in their very natural substances (or properties)” to nourish as such. Christ, too, would be present after a “*natural*,” and not a “*spiritual*” mode of existence, and we should “receive” Him after a *carnal*, not after a “*heavenly*” manner.

We cannot impress upon ourselves too strongly the fact that these two things—the nature of the change in the elements, and the nature of Christ’s Presence, however much we are accustomed for practical purposes to view them as distinct, and to write and speak of them as such, are, in reality, simply two sides of one and the same thing. They are strictly *correlative ideas*; such as the Presence is, such must the change be: such as the change is, such must the Presence be. If we say that the Presence is a “*spiritual*,” *i. e.* a supernatural one, then we

at the same time, by the law of correlative ideas, mentally pronounce the change in the elements to be a supernatural, *i. e.* a substantial one. If we say that the Presence is a "natural" one, we at the same time affirm the change to be a natural, *i. e.* an accidental one. And *vice versâ*: if we say that the change in the elements is only a supernatural, *i. e.* a substantial one, then we at the same time assert that Christ is only "spiritually," *i. e.* supernaturally present. If, on the other hand, we declare the change to be a natural, *i. e.* an accidental one, then we at the same time affirm that the Presence is a Presence after a natural mode of existence, *i. e.* an accidental Presence. If Christ be substantially, *i. e.* supernaturally but *really* there, then is He *and nothing but He* the substance of the Bread and Wine. If Christ be there accidentally, *i. e.* naturally, then is His Body the *only* set of accidents there, and the apparent accidental presence of the Bread and Wine is simply a deception of our senses.

Bearing this law of correlative ideas in our mind, let us apply it to the historical "intention" of the two Churches. They both held this great mystery of our faith in common,—the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence. At the period of the Reformation there were two classes of errors with regard to it; the one a

popular superstition only possible in such a state of ignorance, neglect, and spiritual lethargy as prevailed in the century immediately preceding, which maintained a "natural" Presence; the other, a reaction against this, which in its fear of the abuse of a thing, refused it altogether, and in various forms of negative belief denied the Presence to be in any sense Real. Now it is patent to any one who studies the history of those times that the two Churches had, in the Providence of God, two distinct tasks assigned to them. The Church of England's task it was to defend the faith from superstitious abuse and corruption. The Church of Rome's task it was to build up and strengthen this same faith by careful and precise definition of it, and so to defend it from the attacks of the reactionary Reformers, who would reject it altogether. Hence it came that the Church of England, true to the task God had given her, protested against the "natural" Presence, and "Transaccidentation;" whilst the Church of Rome, true to her special task, asserted the "supernatural" or "sacramental" Presence, and "Transubstantiation." The Church of England's peculiar work was offensive, not defensive;—destructive, not constructive. The Church of Rome's, on the other hand, was defensive rather than offensive, constructive rather than destructive. The

Church of England sought to assert the truth by protesting against its corruptions. The Church of Rome, on the other hand, sought to remove these corruptions by clear dogmatic statements of the truth, and by a vigorous restoration of her whole ecclesiastical and educational discipline. The Church of England took up a new position on a negative basis; the Church of Rome retained the old position on a positive basis. Collect the whole formulæ of the two Churches on this great question, and compare them together, and you will be at once convinced of this. We have nothing whatever to compare with the clear, full, dogmatic statement of the "spirituality" of the Presence, given in chapter iii. of the thirteenth session of the Council of Trent. Our Church asserts, indeed, the "spiritual" nature of the Presence, but almost always in the form of a protest against the "natural" Presence; her assertions respecting it are all negative and offensive; nowhere positive and defensive: they are everywhere destructive of error, nowhere constructive of the faith. They never rise to the height of explaining why the Presence *must be* a "spiritual" one, as the Roman formulæ do; their only endeavour is to shew why it *cannot be* a "natural" one. So again, how meagre, as compared with the Council of Trent, is our



defence of the *reality* of that Presence itself,—the few brief words in the Catechism being the only *formal* proclamation of it which we possess. Thank God! they are amply sufficient to shew us that our Church does hold that doctrine; but would it—I would ask—have been possible for Virtualism and Symbolism to have lived among us these many generations, if we had possessed that marvellously simple yet utterly impregnable defence of the truth constructed by the Council of Trent, in which each erroneous belief is, as it were, confronted and challenged by a special sentinel posted expressly to watch for it, whilst the whole host of unbelieving spirits are kept for ever at bay by that one simple formula, which has been the subject of this whole investigation. On the other hand, although the Council of Trent says quite enough to make it plain that she also rejects the doctrine of a “natural” Presence, yet on this point our own formulæ are more pronounced and more distinctly aggressive. This comparison of the two “intentions” of the two Churches all will surely admit to be nothing but a simple statement of the truth. Can, then, anything be more natural, more reasonable, more consistent with *à priori* probabilities and expectations, than that the Church of Rome should, as I say, assert “Transubstantiation” as the simple correlative of her assertion of the

“spiritual” or “supernatural” Presence, and that the Church of England should, as I have endeavoured to prove, protest against “Transaccidentation” as the simple correlative of her protest against the “corporeal” or “natural” Presence.\*

And in so doing, be it observed, neither Church has at all attempted to define what God has not defined. So far as any definitions of the *manner* of the change and the *mode* of the Presence are concerned, the two Churches have given purely *negative* ones, which in strict language are no definitions at all. They have simply accepted the fact itself as given by Scripture in the Church, and formularised this fact under the laws of thought,—the one Church in offensive, destructive formulæ, the other Church in defensive, constructive formulæ.

---

\* That the view I have taken of this whole subject is no new one, the reader will be convinced by referring to p. 346, fourth edition, of “Wilberforce on the Incarnation,” where occurs the following foot-note *à propos* of a passage in the text, which seemed to a reviewer to imply that the Roman Church held a material presence. After quoting the reviewer’s remarks the Archdeacon says:—“This remark is quoted with the view of guarding against the supposition that the opinion opposed in the text is designed to be attributed to the Church of Rome. The sole object proposed is to shew that Christ’s Real Presence under the forms of Bread and Wine is something wholly distinct from that notion (*viz.* of an accidental change) which is *popularly understood among ourselves* by the term Transubstantiation.”

Two opposite tendencies of the human mind may lead into two opposite errors with respect to this momentous subject. One class of mind may so far ætherialize it as to rob it of all reality; another class may so far materialize it as to rob it of all spirituality. The one class comprehends all Virtualists and Symbolists, the other all those—if there be any such—who believe in a “carnal” Presence. The simple words of Scripture, “This is My Body,” meet both errors. For when formulated under the necessary laws of thought, they are equivalent to this :—

“ This piece of consecrated Bread is Christ’s Body. It cannot *be* both Bread and the Lord’s Body at the same time, in the *same sense* of the word ‘be.’ ” Therefore,

1. In whatever sense it becomes Christ’s Body, it ceases in *that* sense to remain Bread.

Here we have the caution against the first class of errors, against which the Roman formulæ are directed; and

2. In whatever sense it remains Bread, it does not in *that* sense become Christ’s Body.

Here we have the caution against the second class of errors, against which the English formulæ are directed.

I have thus endeavoured to put before the reader, calmly and dispassionately, the reasons

which prevent my concurring in the two popular beliefs with which this Essay deals. May the God of Peace and Love bless this humble attempt to introduce harmony and goodwill into a subject, where hitherto discord and strife have ruled the day! Let me again remind the reader that my task has been most reluctantly undertaken, and that I have treated of this most sacred subject, as it were, under protest. I prefaced this Essay with an appeal to the simple statement of the Council of Trent, as containing all that I care, and, save when higher motives compel, all that I dare to say on so awful a theme. I will conclude it with the similar advice of King Edward in council,\* who, in the words of Cranmer, proclaimed it his "pleasure that every his loving subjects shall devoutly and reverently affirm and take that holy Bread to be Christ's Body, and that cup to be the cup of His holy Blood, according to the purport and effect of holy Scripture, and accommodate themselves rather to take the same Sacrament worthily, than rashly to enter into the discussing of the high mystery thereof."

Oh! what a bitter thought it is that for three long centuries the Precious Blood from those five adorable wounds should have flowed so often

---

\* Cranmer's *Remains and Letters* (Parker Society's Edition), p. 506.

in vain, because over that Precious Blood itself arose, God knows how, a strife which has divided the Church and dismembered the Mystical Body of Christ limb from limb, and left her crippled and forlorn ! Who can tell the number of souls that healing stream has never reached, just because the hands that should have been joined to catch its sacred drops, and bear them to the lost, hung listlessly apart and bore them not ? Who can tell what heights of saintly grace might not have been attained among us, if the Sacramental food had found a reception worthier of it—had found, that is, the “required charity with *all* men,”—a true spirit of brotherly confidence and conciliation towards those millions of another Communion, from whom we keep so far apart, and whom we so often regard with needless mistrust and suspicion ? And now that the enemies of our faith and the seducers of men’s souls are gathering thick around the very Cross itself, how sad, how wrong, how cruel to the Crucified is this state of severance ! O may the Holy Ghost soon move upon the face of these troubled waters, and speak through the Church the words of unity and love !

Surely in these days there is very little danger of men believing in a “natural” and “carnal” Presence. If 200 years ago the Bishops in answer to the Puritans on this very subject said

“that the world was more in danger of profanation than of idolatry,” it surely could be far more truly said now. For such a belief, when it comes at all, comes from a morbid and untaught excess of reverence, from an ignorant and doting love, from a blind and credulous faith. Is this the age of reverence? Is this the age of love? Is this the age of faith? Is this the age even of a reasonable belief in the supernatural agency of the Holy Ghost, in the mysterious workings of Invisible Omnipotency? He must be very blind to the tendencies of thought around him, who can say that it is. No, far from it! Our formulæ speak of a phase of thought which the very Reformation out of which they arose swept for ever away; they are mere echoes of an age with which the genius of the present has absolutely nothing in common; and so they either fall upon men’s ears like idle tales, or, worse mischief still, are made the stepping-stones to error and stumbling-blocks to truth, because they are read in the light of an age for which they were never intended. They only now contribute to two equally deplorable results—one is, to throw a shadow of uncertainty over the teaching of the English Church on *the* one point, which in this age it is most essential to uphold—*viz.* the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence—and the other is to perpetuate a cruel misconcep-

tion as to the belief of millions of our fellowmen, and consequently seriously to hinder the advance of Christ's kingdom upon earth.

To conclude with a practical suggestion. If the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation be what I have described it—and I have good reason for believing I am right—and if, as I trust I have shewn, it forms, in this sense, no further definition, but simply an inevitable corollary of the English doctrine of the Real Objective Presence—then, let all those who believe in this last, petition Convocation to appoint a committee to examine and report upon this question, that we may, if possible, either have the formulæ in question removed, as having done the work for which they were originally intended, or else have it distinctly declared by the Church, that, though retained, they are in no way opposed either to the English doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, or to that statement respecting it to which the Roman Church gives the name of Transubstantiation.

The leaders of our Church have, alas ! with one noble exception, declined to speak out on this question. The primate has indeed said that our Church holds the doctrine of the Real Presence, but by his qualifying addition of the epithet “ spiritual,” without that explanation of the true meaning of this word so necessary in

these days of its altered sense, he has left his assertion open to a subjective or virtualistic interpretation. The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, in a recent sermon, protested against a "natural" presence in a manner certainly calculated to imply that there were those in the Church of England who held it, but he carefully avoided, even when subsequently pressed by Archdeacon Denison, giving any clear dogmatic statement of his own belief on the question.

The Bishop of London, in his recent charge, openly and directly alluded to the present advocacy by men in the Church of "Roman" doctrines on the subject of the Holy Eucharist, but he studiously abstained from stating what these Roman doctrines were, and what were the doctrines of the Church of England with which they were at variance. Throughout the whole of this remarkable charge there is not a single specification of doctrine, Roman or English—not a single attempt to point out by quotation from sermon or pamphlet, tract or manual, the *grounds* of this cruel and wanton accusation. There is here no trace of "examination had," no sign of a compunction "that it were unreasonable to send a prisoner" before the bar of a loyal people, branding him with disloyalty, "and not withal to *signify* the crimes laid against him."



How long will our bishops deal thus unfairly with us, and filling their charges with all the bitterness of vague and harsh insinuations, never attempt, in the true spirit of fatherly tenderness and love, to tell us what opinions we are to maintain, if we are to be, as we all desire to be, loyal servants, and not traitors to our Church? Surely their high office cannot exempt them from the responsibility of having dogmatic opinions on this great question. Let them, then, in all honesty, declare what these opinions are, and cease to give their imprimatur to every passing taunt and aspersion which crosses the lips of the thoughtless and profane. The time has now come when all this vacillation, all this reserve, all this uncertainty should cease. In the present age, and in the face of the peculiar genius against which the Church has to fight, a compromise on this question at least would be a crime. Either our Lord is "really, truly, and substantially" present in the Eucharist, or He is not there at all. There is no middle course. Virtualism, equally with Zuinglianism, is a denial of the Real Presence.

Let then the "English Church Union"—who are pledged to "maintain the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England"—organise an appeal to Convocation, and demand a distinct utterance from the Church on this question.

They have a right to know whether the "Real Objective Presence" is one of the doctrines they pledge themselves to defend, and she alone it is who has a right to tell them whether it is one or not.

Let the "Association for Promoting the Corporate Re-union of Christendom" also organise a similar appeal to Convocation, demanding a distinct explanation from the Church of her word "Transubstantiation." They, as advocates of Corporate Re-union, have a right to know in what relation their Church stands to that of Rome in this matter, and whether or not the mass of our clergy are right in believing that it is the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation which she repudiates, and not another.

The removal of these uncertainties would be an infinite gain to the Church at large. It would strengthen the hands of thousands of our English Priests, whose influence for good is now weakened by the prevailing impression that their teaching on this most important point is not that of the Church at whose altars they serve. It would also materially contribute towards breaking down that wall of prejudice and misconception which has so long hindered a nation generally distinguished for its candour and fair-dealing, from even an attempt to become acquainted with the real teaching of

another Communion. For if it be found that on this point, of all others, we have been these many generations labouring under a delusion, it will increase the *à priori* probability that in other points too we may find our impressions really false ones, and so may pave the way for a ready reception of such authoritative statements as might hereafter be made concerning them. In any case the mere attempt to remove such a cause of estrangement between two large Christian bodies, whether successful or not in its immediate object, must at least help on the growth of that love whereby alone faith can work and souls be saved. It is no exaggeration to say that in every Christian heart in which this antagonism is suffered to remain unchallenged, and without sure and certain, yea, painful and laborious proof of its sad necessity, in that heart the power of Christian love, and therefore of the faith which worketh by love, is restrained, and God's merciful designs for the salvation of all are hindered. Can any earnest Christian man, who loves the Lord Jesus in sincerity, acquiesce any longer in this deplorable strife and division, when all should be united against the common foe? Can you, my reader, find any peace and any comfort in your soul, whilst you think of these rendings of the seamless robe, these fractures of the sacred limbs

“ Of Christ,  
Whose sad face on the Cross sees only this  
After the passion of a thousand years ?”

“ Oh ! pray for the peace of Jerusalem,  
They shall prosper that love thee.”

*Domine, Jesu Christe, qui dixisti apostolis tuis,  
pacem relinquo vobis, pacem meam do vobis, ne  
respicias peccata mea, sed fidem Ecclesiæ tuæ ; eamque  
secundum voluntatem tuam pacificare et coadunare  
digneris ; qui vivis et regnas Deus, per omnia sæcula  
sæculorum. Amen.*

*Pater Noster.*

**A. M. D. G.**

## POSTSCRIPT.

I HERE print, by way of postscript, the following letter, extracted from the *Guardian* of June 19th :—

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY'S CHARGE.

§ 1. SIR—I hope you will allow a little space to one of those who signed the Dorchester Protest against the Charge of the Bishop of Salisbury, in vindication of the position we have taken, and which is seriously though not directly impugned in a recent article of your influential paper. If your statement that the martyr Latimer (or any other of the leading Reformers) “went to the utmost length to which the Charge goes” be a correct one, we who have protested are certainly to be condemned as guilty of logomachy,—a charge which I for one would most unwillingly submit to. It must ever be a painful trial to a Christian to be in opposition to those who are in lawful authority; and it is the more painful to us from the affection which we feel personally to our Bishop, and from the uniform kindness and courtesy with which he has treated us. Nothing but a conviction that he has been enjoining upon us doctrines which we believe to be opposed to the doctrines of the Church would have induced us to act as we have done. We cannot doubt that these doctrines will in course of time draw after them the whole train of idolatries and superstitions which have resulted from them in the Church of Rome; and as an indication of the correctness of this conclusion we point to the excesses of ritualism already visible, and clung to, as their abettors boast, with a “passionate devotion.”

§ 2. Excuse my saying I was amazed when I read your statement that our Bishop had "*said nothing inconsistent with the witness of those whose special vocation it was to begin the resistance to Romish errors.*" No doubt it appeared to you that your quotation from Latimer justified the above statement, but you have overlooked the most important part of the Bishop's Charge, and that in which the opposition of his views to those of our martyrs and of the Church mainly and most distinctly consists. I refer to his declaration that "*the inward part of the Sacrament is that which our Lord took from the Blessed Virgin, and which He offered to God as an atoning sacrifice,*" together with the addition that the body of Christ is so present in the Sacrament by virtue of the consecration of the priest.

§ 3. Now, sir, this is not only not identical with the teaching of the martyrs as to the "real presence (in the Sacrament) of the spiritual body of Christ with all faithful believers" (as quoted by you from Latimer), but *it is directly opposed to it*. The Bishop's doctrine is almost verbally the very one that was maintained by the Romish persecutors of the martyrs. The latter were required to subscribe to three propositions, the first of which affirmed the presence of Christ's natural body; the second, Transubstantiation; the third, the propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass. To the first of these I will confine myself, as being the most important and the root of the others. It was thus defined: "*In the sacrament of the altar there is present the natural body of Christ, conceived of the Virgin Mary, by virtue of God's word spoken by the priest.*"

§ 4. Now, Sir, if there be any difference between this and the Bishop's view, I am unable to discern it, and so far is it from being (as you affirm) in substance the same or even reconcilable with that of our martyrs, *that it is the very doctrine they resisted unto death.*

We, who protest against the Bishop's doctrine, believe, as Latimer, Ridley, and Cranmer did, that there is in the Sacrament a "real spiritual presence of Christ with all

true believers," but it is in their hearts, and not objectively, locally, or corporeally in the bread. The bread is Christ's body sacramentally and representatively. By the act of consecration it is changed as to its use, but not in the least as to its substance, either by Transubstantiation or Consubstantiation. The former of these is expressly disclaimed by the Bishop: I wish he could also disclaim the latter, but how he can do so I see not. His words are before us—*viz.* that the "inward part of the Sacrament is that *which Christ took from the Blessed Virgin, and which He offered to God as an atoning sacrifice.*"

§ 5. 'Tis true he afterwards qualifies this by saying that the presence of the body of Christ is "supernatural, heavenly, invisible, incomprehensible, spiritual," in all which we quite agree with his lordship. But, if so, we are constrained to ask him, How is it possible that it can be that which *He took from the Blessed Virgin and which He offered on the Cross?*

§ 6. Did not our Lord take from His mother a true human nature, a body that was *natural, material, visible?*

§ 7. To teach that *the body which He took of the Virgin* is supernatural, invisible, and only spiritual, and therefore really present on a hundred thousand altars at once, is to undermine a fundamental article of the Creed—*viz.* the truth and reality of His Human nature.

§ 8. It is to sanction the heresy of the Eutychians, as Bishop Ridley argued against his persecutors.

§ 9. It leads almost inevitably to idolatry, for if "Christ Himself," as the Bishop of Salisbury says, be present *in the body which He took of the Virgin* in the consecrated bread, they who believe it begin to adore the Sacrament, which the Church of England declares to be "idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians."

§ 10. It would also follow that if "Christ Himself" be thus present "objectively" in the bread, He would be received equally by all communicants, by the formal and profane as well as by the godly. This would be in flat

contradiction to the Twenty-ninth Article, which declares that "they who are void of a lively faith are in nowise partakers of Christ, though they eat the sign or sacrament of so great a thing."

§ 11. I do not enter into the subject of a propitiatory sacrifice in the Sacrament, but confine myself to that of the real presence; and I think, Sir, you will allow I have said enough to show you were mistaken in your belief that the Bishop of Salisbury had not gone beyond the doctrine of our Reformers, and that we who have protested have not done so without a cause.

§ 12. One objection may be made to the conclusiveness of my argument.

It may be said that though it be the very body of the Lord which He took of the Virgin, it is not present after the same manner that it was before His Passion, and that therefore it may be supernaturally in the Sacrament though it be naturally in heaven.

§ 13. I answer that this destroys all certainty of proof of that cardinal fact of Christianity—the actual Resurrection of the Saviour. How was the actuality thereof demonstrated but by the evidence of the senses? Did He not delay His return to Heaven for forty days, on purpose that, "by many infallible proofs," by His being repeatedly *seen* by His disciples, by their hearing His voice—by their eating and drinking with Him, by their placing their fingers in His pierced side and hands and feet, they might be certainly assured it was no phantom, but Jesus Himself in the truth of His human *body which He took of the Blessed Virgin*. If that body can be on a hundred thousand altars at once, notwithstanding the evidence of *all the senses* that it is not there, how can we be sure that He really did rise from the dead? The doctrine of the Bishop destroys the foundation of all human belief. He has no such intention, but so it is. If the senses cannot judge of the presence or absence of a human body, then is Christ not raised and we are yet in our sins. They *do* judge that it is absent in the



Sacrament, and *the Lord Himself has sanctioned an appeal to them.* It was of His *Resurrection body* He said to the disciples (who were terrified and affrighted because they thought He was a spirit), "Handle me and see that it is I myself, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have."

§ 14. In the Fourth Article of our Church we affirm our belief that Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again His body, with flesh, bones, and all things pertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith He ascended into heaven, and there sitteth until He return to judge all men at the last day. It is further laid down in the Prayer Book that it is "against the truth of Christ's natural body to be in two places at once:" it is in heaven, and therefore cannot be here in the Sacrament. All this, Sir, we believe, for it can be proved by certain warrant of Scripture; and, for the same reason, we must reject the doctrine of our Bishop's Charge. Not in formality but in all sincerity do we pray for him, that in this particular he may be delivered from error, and that both he and ourselves may be led into all truth by the One Infallible Teacher, the Holy Ghost. It is not the presence of the Lord in the flesh, but it is the indwelling of His Spirit that brings light and strength and comfort and salvation to the soul of man. It was expedient for the Apostles that Christ *should go away*, in order that the Comforter might come. Christ *did go away* into heaven, and will not come again to earth in *the body which He took of the Blessed Virgin* until the day of His second advent. Meanwhile, by eating the bread and drinking of the cup, we don't bring Him down, but we show forth His death *till He come*. God give us grace to do so in a right manner, for *if* with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy Sacrament, then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood; then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us.

REGINALD SMITH.

Rectory, Stafford, Dorchester.

§ 15. [We did not "overlook the most important part of

the Bishop's Charge," to which our correspondent refers ; but are rather inclined to think he has himself overlooked some clauses which in a great measure answer his objections. Surely, *e.g.*, when the Bishop avers that "it is the presence not of a carnal but of a ghostly substance," that form of a gross and fleshly presence termed Consubstantiation is as unequivocally rejected as the other, Transubstantiation.

§ 16. Our correspondent correctly states the proposition to which Latimer's assent was required. He should notice, however, how the martyr deals with it. Latimer demurs to it, and with good reason, as "set forth with certain new terms lately found that be obscure, and do not sound according to the Scripture ;" but he does not actually reject even the phrase "natural presence," whilst describing his own faith in the terms "spiritual" but "real" presence.

§ 17. Our correspondent should note the ambiguity of the phrase "natural body." If we adhere to the language of Scripture (1 Cor. xv. 44), the glorified Body of the Lord is no longer a "natural" but a "spiritual" body. Yet the "Black Rubric" asserts that His "Natural Body is in heaven and not here." The Bishop of Salisbury is quite consistent with himself, with this declaration, and also with S. Paul, when he observes in the Charge "the presence of the Body is not after the manner or laws of a body, according to which ordinary laws our Lord's Body is in heaven and not here ; but is a supernatural, heavenly, invisible, incomprehensible, and so a spiritual presence."

§ 18. After this manner surely the Lord may be present at a "hundred thousand altars at once," as He may be, and is, in as many churches. The assertion of this faculty of His Divine Nature does not so tend to Eutychianism as does the denial of it to contravention of those significant Scriptures which teach us that His Resurrection Body

L

was no longer limited by all those laws which govern ours.

§ 19. Our correspondent would do well to ask himself, since he believes that Christ's Body is "verily and indeed" present in the Eucharist, what Body that can be except that which "He took from the Blessed Virgin?"

§ 20. We are not concerned to defend the language of the Bishop of Salisbury *per se*. We only said, and we say again, that it is not at all inconsistent with the tenets of our Reformers, and is such as has been often before employed by our standard divines. Yet both the Charge and the letter of our correspondent appear to us to be instances of that employment of reasoning and speculation on themes proper to faith and love which has led to such endless, and, for the most part, unprofitable controversies. But the advocates of low views of the Sacraments are mainly responsible for the emphatic and over-technical language which their opponents employ in defining and defending their own opposed, and to our thinking more nearly orthodox, belief.]

I have here reprinted in full this remarkable letter, because it is a most able statement of the writer's side of the case by a man whom all must admire for his undoubted piety and large-hearted Christian charity, and as such, it is worth preserving by all those whose love of truth makes them anxious to have both sides of a question fairly put before them. The letter too, and the editorial remarks in answer to it, curiously illustrate in certain points the truth of some of the statements I have ventured to make in this Essay.

For instance, in the paragraph which I have

marked as § 15, we have the Editor of a reputed High Church paper, who professes to be defending the Real Objective Presence, speaking of Transubstantiation as a “form of a *gross and fleshly* Presence,” and that, too, in a context where Roman doctrine is evidently being alluded to ; a curious proof of the prevalence, even in quarters where one would least look for it, of that erroneous belief with which this Essay deals, and which attributes to the Church of Rome a doctrine which she has always most emphatically and distinctly repudiated. Whilst, on the other hand, we have a Low Churchman (see § 4) clearly perceiving—although he has not apprehended the right meaning of either term—that in some sense or other the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence involves that of Transubstantiation, which fact it has been my endeavour throughout this Essay to prove.

The answer to most of the objections Mr. Smith brings forward, the careful reader of this Essay will, I trust, have already anticipated. There are, however, two points in connection with the letter on which I should like to say a few words more.

The first is, that it is a historical inaccuracy to suppose that the martyrs died because they protested against authorised Roman doctrine ; although it is true that they withheld their

assent from certain propositions, which, in the then unsettled state of theological language, might seem to imply error when read in the light of popular corruptions of the truth then very prevalent. Their thus withholding their assent was doubtless the *formal* cause of their sentence, but it was by no means the *actual* cause of it. No careful reader of the history of those times can doubt that the whole business was a purely *political*, or ecclesio-political question, and not a doctrinal one. It is true that the decrees of the Council of Trent, on this particular question of the Real Presence, had been passed previously to the examination of the martyrs, but only a short time previously, and we know how long it takes for exact theological terms and ideas to permeate and take possession of the minds and the tongues of a large number. A comparison of phraseology will at once shew that they had not yet reached England, for the phrase "natural Body" as used in the proposition alluded to in § 3 of Mr. Smith's letter, is carefully avoided in the decrees of the Council, which speak only of the "real or substantial Body being present after a Sacramental and not after a natural mode of existence." Again, it is impossible to compare the language of the Reformers with that of the Council of Trent, without seeing that the

doctrine maintained by both is precisely the same. For instance, let us put in parallel columns the words of Ridley when under examination, and those of the Council itself.

WORDS OF RIDLEY.

"It is His true Blood which is in the chalice, I grant, and the same which sprang from the side of Christ, . . . . *but by way of a Sacrament.*

COUNCIL OF TRENT.

. . . "our Saviour Himself sitteth ever at the right hand of the Father in heaven according to His natural mode of existence, but in many other places He is *sacramentally* present for us in His substance (*i. e.* "really" not "virtually,"—as Ridley says "it is His true Blood," and no mere figure) after *that* mode of existence, which we cannot express in words, but which we ought to and do maintain to be possible with God."

No one, one would think, could have any doubt, after reading these words, of the absolute identity of doctrine between them. Had the Tridentine Decrees been published only a few years earlier, so as to have enabled the representatives of Rome, on the one hand, to have been more dogmatically precise in their language, and also to have apprised Ridley, on the other, of what Rome really taught; and had there been no politics, and no personal anti-

pathies at the bottom of the whole question, who can doubt but that the fires of Oxford would never have been lighted?

The second point to which I would advert is, the charge of the deception of the senses alluded to in paragraphs 13 and 14 of the letter. And first, I would observe that the doctrine of Transubstantiation does not involve any such deception as is commonly supposed. It is not as if you took a bit of wood, and carved and painted it to look exactly like an apple, and then palmed it off upon the beholder as a real apple. That would be a deception of the senses. But here, as has been fully shewn in the Essay, is nothing of the kind. All is true to sense, as much after as before consecration; it is only in that of which the senses tell us absolutely nothing that the change takes place.

But although our senses are not deceived, it may be said that our senses deceive us, and this is true *in a certain sense of the words*: as S. Thomas says :—

Visus, gustus, tactus in te fallitur,  
Sed auditu solo tuto creditur.

Taste, and touch, and vision in Thee are deceived,  
But the hearing only may be well believed.

But it is not true in the ordinary sense of the words; it is simply in that sense in which

every act of faith is—not contradictory of, but—  
complementary to an act of sense :—

Prestet fides supplementum  
Sensuum defectui.

And in this sense the whole of Christianity is a deception of the senses, and it is mere nonsense to speak of such deception as cutting at the roots of our faith. Was it through the senses, we may well ask, that the first adorers of the Infant Jesus recognised in the poor babe in the lowly manger the Incarnate God? Throughout the whole of God's sojourn upon earth, the senses saw Him as a man, and as man only. For this recognition of the fundamental truth of Christianity the senses were powerless; it was the gift of "faith, the evidence of things unseen." Our Lord Himself lays particular stress upon this point. "He saith unto them, Whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona, for *flesh and blood hath not revealed* it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven;" and it is on this *rock of faith*, as doubtless Mr. Smith would interpret the following verse, that Christ builds His Church, and not on the mere shifting sands of sense.

Mr. Smith also makes a difficulty for himself



in not distinguishing, as the Editor points out, between the ante and post-resurrection Body of our Lord. Of course in one sense they are the same, and the only Body our Lord ever had, or ever can have, is that "which He took of the Virgin Mary, and which He offered to God as an atoning sacrifice." But in another sense they are different bodies, inasmuch as their powers and properties are different, and it is only that portion of our Lord's post-resurrection life on earth in which He acted as a natural body (the powers of which are included in those of the spiritual), that any "appeal is sanctioned to the senses." In the case of His acts as a spiritual body we need an appeal to higher faculties than those of sense, even to that "faith by which we believe in God, who quickeneth the dead, and who calleth those things that be not, as though they were."

If we are content to appeal to sense as the sole standard of our belief, we are then only believing what "flesh and blood reveals,"—we are only imitating the Jews, who said, "Is not this the carpenter's son?" And it is precisely because the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence, as a high act of faith, is a protest against this lowering appeal to sense, that it is so essential to uphold it in the present age of materialistic scepticism, and denial of all that is spiritual.

Mr. Smith's axiom, that "if the senses cannot judge of the presence or absence of a human body, then is Christ not raised, and we are yet in our sins," besides being theologically most unsound, is logically a fallacy, because it presupposes that our Lord's post-resurrection Body was a human body, in the sense in which each living man we see around us is a human body, *and nothing more*—that is, that His resurrection Body was a body *exclusively* after a natural mode of existence. This, besides being inconsistent with the facts related of it, is also diametrically opposed to S. Paul's dogmatic exposition of the doctrine of the resurrection, which asserts unmistakably the vast superiority in powers and properties of the spiritual or post-resurrection body to the natural or ante-resurrection body. Our senses may indeed tell us of the presence or absence of an ordinary human body; but that is nothing to the point here, unless Mr. Smith is prepared to maintain the absolute identity in character and kind of the ante and the post-resurrection body; and, therefore, as I say, his axiom, which assumes this identity, is, in its present application, a fallacy. Of spiritual bodies our senses tell us nothing, and therefore, to make them, as did the unbelieving Jews of old, the ground of appeal in matters of divine doctrine, is, to use Mr. Smith's words, "to destroy the

foundation of all belief," and to open the doors to every form of scepticism and infidelity.

To deny the Real Objective Presence is, moreover, to destroy all confidence in human language as a vehicle of thought, and to violate all canons of Scripture interpretation. For, when stripped of all modifying circumlocution and controversial verbiage, it simply amounts to this, that we are prepared to assert in the face of the unanimous teaching of the Primitive Church, that when Christ said, "This is my Body," He really meant to say, "This is not my Body;" and such an assertion does violence to all recognised laws of language and of Scriptural interpretation.

It is perhaps just worth while, in conclusion, to point out that Mr. Smith is not sufficiently alive to the ambiguous meaning of the word "Sacrament;" and also that, in bringing a charge of idolatry against a large party in the Church, he does not quote the Black Rubric accurately. It is needless to remark that no one adores the Sacrament in the sense in which Mr. Smith here uses the term, *i. e.* the *signum Sacramenti*; and that it is "the adoration of the Sacramental Bread and Wine," and not that of the Sacrament itself (*i. e.* the *res Sacramenti*), which the Church pronounces "idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians."

## APPENDIX.

---

NOTE A.—(To page 55.)

### ON THE ADOPTION BY THE CHURCH OF THE ARISTOTELIAN PHRASEOLOGY.

SINCE writing this Essay my attention has been directed to a very remarkable and valuable little pamphlet on this subject published by Mr. Palmer, and entitled “ Transubstantiation, or Thoughts on the Change consequent on Consecration in the Lord’s Supper, by an English Churchman ;” in which the writer seems to take exception to the doctrine of the Roman Church on account of “ its dependence on a certain peculiar theory of physics.”—(p. 11.)

This objection seems to me to be met by his own statement a few lines further on, where he says : —“ Whether this is a true view of natural objects or not it is not for theologians to determine ; but being popular at the time when the Roman doctrine of the Eucharist was finally fixed, this view served as a base for that doctrine ; the intrinsic quasi-spiritual substance of the elements

was said to be changed, the accidents remaining as they were before."

The fact is, the Church, in dealing with mankind in general, must adopt such language as is most prevalently associated at the time being with the truths she wishes to teach, if she is to make her teaching intelligible to the greatest number: and even long after successive developments of scientific thought have rendered such language, *when taken literally*, an inaccurate expression of the facts implied, the terminology will still sometimes survive as their most useful and *practically* most truthful exponent. No one, for instance, would be prepared to expunge from human language all such expressions as "sunrise" and "sunset," or to admit that their retention is otherwise than useful, even after centuries of scientific thought have rendered them *literally* inaccurate. The Church does not by adopting and retaining such terminology give her imprimatur to the science of the day as permanent and absolute truth, she only adopts it, as the world in general adopts it, as a serviceable medium of communication for what she has to teach. Supposing there existed at the present day a widely-understood philosophical system, with a definite terminology largely received by mankind in general, which rendered the Aristotelian nomenclature not merely obsolete but *practically* misleading,—the Church, if she had occasion to recast her Formularies on this ques-

tion, might indeed adopt that language so far as it was susceptible of conveying the simple fact of the change truly and really effected. But it seems to me that the whole drift of the Author's pamphlet is to prove that practically Transubstantiation is the best word, even in these days, for expressing the change implied. And there can hardly be any doubt, that whatever may be the details of scientific criticism which opposite schools may apply to the Aristotelian definitions, they do in a *general way* represent ideas common to the race, whilst they certainly harmonize with other features in human language, which no lapse of time or change of idea has yet succeeded in obliterating. And if we are to use the term "substance" and its compounds at all, it must be in some such well-known and strictly-defined sense as can preserve it from confusion with those many loose and various applications of the word current in our own, though not in all other languages (*e.g.* German); for it is precisely the prevalence of these multifarious applications of the word which have given rise to so much error among us, by involving our formulæ in obscurity, and necessitating—to quote our author—the employment of "qualifications difficult to be reconciled with the fundamental idea," instead of "distinctly stating the fact of a miraculous change" in its simple integrity. No more notable instance of the unfortunate influence of such an ambiguous element in our phraseology could be

found than was presented in the "Declaration" on Eucharistic doctrine, recently put forth by leading Priests among us, and in which the parallel presence of "Repudiation" clauses, although intelligible to the theologian, must have left on the mind of the uninstructed reader an impression of doctrine quite different from that which the memorial was intended to convey. The author of this pamphlet well says (p. 7), "Unable to feel perfectly satisfied with the notion of co-existence, much less with Consubstantiation, Virtualism, bare Symbolism, or the grosser form of Transubstantiation, I submit that the most Scriptural, Catholic, and logical belief is this, that in the Holy Eucharist Bread and Wine, having been consecrated according to our Lord's ordinance, are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, not, of course, apparently nor physically, but yet really and substantially. In some mysterious manner which transcends our knowledge, the sanctified Bread and Wine cease to be what they were, and become what they were not. This it seems necessary to believe; what is more or less is questionable."

So far, so good; but when he goes on to say:—

"For instance, it is unsafe to rest on any explanation depending on the Aristotelian notion of substance and accident; equally so to assert positively that the Bread and Wine remain substantially unchanged," then I reply—if he can

produce any *other* expressions or “notions” by which his assertion of the “substantial” change can be made to produce upon the general reader the effect he intends—then, well and good; let him produce them. But if he cannot guard against popular misapplications of his epithet “substantial,” otherwise than by an assertion that he uses the word in its strict philosophical sense, then, whilst I would join with him in deprecating any “*dependence*” on the Aristotelian notion (which the Church nowhere implies), still I would say that this notion, whatever be the scientific criticisms to which it may be exposed, is still sufficiently intelligible to the general mass of mankind to make it unsafe for the Church to discard its service, as a medium of communicating the great fact, that the Bread and Wine at consecration are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ.



## NOTE B.—(To page 79.)

SINCE writing this Essay, No. V. of the "Tracts of the Day," on the "Real Presence," has appeared, in which this parallel of the Hypostatic Union is again adopted. On page 24 of the Tract the writer says, "There is a union, almost hypostatic, which joins the outward part to the Body and Blood of Christ, the reality or substance of the Sacrament. The union once formed by consecration, and they become inseparable; . . . after consecration (page 25), we can no more contemplate the 'outward and inward' apart from each other than we can, after the incarnation, contemplate the Deity and Humanity of our Lord as separate personalities. They are still distinct in their nature; but in their indissoluble union they form the One Person of Christ Jesus. So, in the Eucharist, the union of the Bread and Wine with the Body and Blood of Christ, each remaining in its own nature, constitutes the Sacrament."

Here indeed we have simply the word "nature" used, and not, as in Mr. Stuart's work, "natural substance;" otherwise it would be hard to see how this last sentence, if language be strictly used, could escape the charge of Consubstantiation; but as the accidents, and they alone, are all we

know of the "nature" of Bread and Wine, the assertion here made is in a sense true. On the other hand, to speak of this "union" as "almost hypostatic" would seem to introduce a dangerous element into our phraseology, which in the minds of the unlearned must lead to the conception of some sort of "Consubstantial Presence." I have endeavoured in the Essay to shew that the true parallel in the case lies between the word "substance" in the case of the Eucharist, and "person" in the case of the "Incarnation," and in the passage above quoted this parallel seems to be partially hinted at, though not fully expressed. If I might be allowed to fill in the sentence according to my idea of the true parallel, it would run thus: "After consecration we can no more contemplate the "outward and inward" as *separate substances* than we can after the incarnation contemplate the Deity and Humanity of our Lord as separate personalities;" or, to express it in the form I should prefer, as shorter and more decided: "We can no more admit the presence of two Substances in the Eucharistic Union, than we can the existence of two Persons in the Hypostatic."

And now, to complete and illustrate my parallel, I would ask, "What is this *one* indivisible Substance?" and the answer is given me in the very first sentence of the Tract which I have quoted: "the Body and Blood of Christ" is "the Reality or Substance of the Sacrament." And just as

M

S. Peter in his confession of faith, when he said, "*Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God,*" addressed in his thoughts, as the subject of the pronoun "*Thou,*" the One Divine *Person*, God the Son Himself, though veiled in flesh—just so, when we repeat the awful words "*This is My Body,*" the *substance* and reality which in our thoughts is the subject of the pronoun "*this,*" is the Body and Blood of Christ, though under the form of Bread and Wine. It cannot be that we have in our thoughts the same subject to the pronoun "*this,*" as applied to the Bread, after as before consecration; this the language of Scripture, as given us by the Church, forbids, for the pronoun in the Greek cannot refer to the Bread, being of a different gender from it; we are compelled, therefore, to supply a different subject for the pronoun "*this,*" directly the act of consecration is performed. The subject of the pronoun was before consecration "*Bread,*" it is after consecration something else; there is a change. If the Bread were any longer there—whether by union or otherwise—in *the same sense* in which it was there before, why this change of pronoun? Faith, in obedience to the words of our Lord as given to us by the Church, compels us to say that in some sense what was Bread before, is now no longer Bread. Reason, again, which faith can transcend but cannot contradict, compels us to say that in that sense in which the Bread is the existent cause of certain impressions on

the senses, it continues to exist Bread as before ; and it is as drawing a distinction between these two senses that the Church of Rome has found it convenient to make use of a philosophical nomenclature, sufficiently widely received and understood for her purpose ; and so she says with reason that the accidents remain, whilst she also says with faith in obedience to our Lord's words that the substance is changed ; and thus she repudiates all form of " union," " absorption," or " co-existence " of one substance with the other, as being philologically no true grammatical acceptance of the words of Christ, and as being philosophically a contradiction of reason ; for reason tells us that a thing can no more be two things—*i. e.* two substances or realities—than two distinct Persons can be one and the same Person, or two distinct bodies wholly occupy one and the same space. To maintain otherwise would seem to introduce hopeless confusion into language, as well as seriously to imperil, by the introduction of a false analogy, the one cardinal doctrine of our faith—our belief, namely, in our Incarnate Lord, " Who is not two, but one Christ." In illustration of this I will only quote one more passage from the close of this Tract, in which (page 71), after quoting various expressions in our Liturgy, the writer justly remarks :—

" Nothing of this could be, unless Christ were truly present in His Real Body to feed us in a spiritual and heavenly manner, the only way in

which souls can be fed. Faith realises the unseen ; and passing beyond that which is visible to sense, receives the Blessed Sacrament with unwavering assurance that it is the Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ." And this is the truth it has been the endeavour of the present treatise to maintain ; but it is a truth with which all such expressions as refer to a "union" of the two substances,—whether "almost" or wholly hypostatic—or to a Presence of the one simply in, with, by, or under the other, are altogether inconsistent and logically irreconcilable. The doctrine of the Real Objective Presence asserts the Presence of Christ Himself, not in, with, by, or under the Bread and Wine, but simply in the form, shape, or appearance of Bread and Wine : just as the Holy Ghost was present not in, with, by, or under a dove, but simply "in a bodily shape as it were\* of a dove,"—not in, with, by, or under, but in the "appearance of cloven tongues as of fire." And this doctrine, which asserts the Real Objective Presence of Christ in this form or shape, cannot at the same time assert the Real Objective Presence of the Bread and Wine, without open violation of the simplest laws of thought. We cannot maintain the Objective Presence of Christ's Body and Blood, as that which the elements by consecra-

---

\* The expression is a remarkable one, ὡσεὶ περιστέρην, as if it had been a dove, which it really was not.

tion have become, and yet maintain in the very same sense the continued Objective Presence of the elements themselves. We cannot say in the same breath, and in the same sense of the words, that "*this* has become *that* and yet remains *this*;" that is a downright mockery of thought and language. No! we assert that over the elements a mysterious change passes, and the Church of Rome has found the word Transubstantiation the most fitting word for expressing—not the nature, manner, or mode,—but the *fact* of that change in a sense which satisfies the words of Christ, without violating the plain dictates of reason. The adoption of this term in its true sense by our branch of the Church, and the removal of it in that other sense in which it has hitherto been used by it, would be a very great assistance both in spreading truth among ourselves, and in helping to remove a needless barrier of separation between us and the rest of Western Christendom. May we soon have to rejoice over one more victory won over the enemy of souls, who has so long been employing these apparent ambiguities and antagonisms for the spread of error and the discomfiture of truth.

## NOTE C.—(To page 106.)

## ON COMMUNION IN ONE KIND ONLY.

As there is much misunderstanding and consequently much unnecessary prejudice abroad on the subject of the Roman practice in this matter, it will not be inconsistent with the main object of this Essay to add a few remarks on this question by way of appendix.

The view of it most prevalent among us is undoubtedly that expressed by the phrase in the text—"Refusal of the cup to the laity,"—a phrase most commonly but most incorrectly applied to it; for it seems to imply a kind of arrogant distinction as of caste between Priest and layman, whereby the latter has, as is thought, his Sacramental privileges curtailed by an arbitrary enactment of a usurping priesthood;—whereas nothing can be further from the real intention of the custom. So far from its being the laity only to whom it applies, not even the Pope himself, when receiving, is allowed the use of the cup; it is only the particular consecrating Priest, performing the symbolical act of the separation of Body and Blood necessary to the sacrifice and the shewing forth of the Lord's death, who communicates under both kinds.

But it is not only in this more popular view of it that erroneous conceptions shew themselves. Even among the more Catholic of our divines we often hear it described as a flagrant and open violation of the words of institution,—a “mutilation” of a Sacrament,—and some have even gone so far as to express their doubts lest this mode of reception should involve some diminution of the fulness of sacramental grace to the receiver. Such views as these are, I venture to say, hardly in accordance with strict truth, and if pressed to their full meaning would certainly be heretical. To limit the presence of the Body to the Bread, and of the Blood to the Wine, in anything beyond the verbal sense given above (p. 102), savours most dangerously of a carnal, material view of the Eucharist, and if pressed at all literally, in the form, alas ! recently broached among us, tends to an heretical denial of the Catholic doctrine, that “Christ whole and entire is under either species.” It is worth observing that one of the very reasons given for the Roman custom is to confirm this truth in the minds of the people, and to protest against the heresy which denied it.

Neither can we say that the custom is a violation of the institution in any such sense as that it may be proved from Scripture *only* to be so. For if, on the one hand, the words “Drink ye all of it,” be held to imply, in virtue of this word “all,” a *special* reference to the whole Church, laity included, and not merely to those present



and their successors, then we ought to administer *the cup only* to the laity. If, on the other hand, the more natural interpretation be taken, which holds the word "all" to be inserted because they were all *severally, each in his' turn*, to drink of this one cup passed round to them (as in the case of the cup before supper, "Take this and divide it among yourselves,")—whereas, in the case of the Bread, the division had already been made by our Lord Himself, and each received his share individually for himself at the same time, and there was no necessity for any further *distributive* being introduced;—then, in this case, any such application of the words as implied a reference to the laity at all would justify a similar application of any other part of the ritual of institution, as, for instance, the *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε*. The dilemma is unavoidable, and any attempt to extract a proof in favour of Communion in both kinds out of the words of institution ends logically in this, that either the laity are to receive the cup only, or a layman may celebrate. From the record of the institution given in the Gospels, as has been often observed, we learn absolutely nothing of lay-Communion in any shape or kind; this we learn only from other passages of Holy Writ. The words of institution were addressed, as our Church in her Liturgy teaches us, to the Apostolate and Priesthood only, and are directly sacrificial, and only inferentially sacramental.

Neither when we come to other Scripture is the

case by any means so clear in favour of Communion under both kinds as most of us are apt to suppose. We often hear that verse in the 6th chapter of S. John, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you," quoted as if that settled the whole matter—quoted, too, strangely enough, by those who for any other application refuse to acknowledge any sacramental reference at all in this chapter. But we must not forget that the Church teaches us that he who receives the Bread only does equally drink the Blood as eat the Flesh of Christ; and these words, therefore, are just as much fulfilled by the Roman as by the English custom. It is worth observing, too, that for twelve times in this chapter in which reference is made to the Bread or Flesh and to eating only, the drinking is mentioned only four times, and is confined to one particular portion of the discourse, whereas the whole structure and context of it, along with the preceding miracle, point to the eating only. Nor should we forget that in the earliest history of the Church, the Eucharist is always spoken of in terms implying the same thing (see Acts ii. 42, 46, xx. 7); and if S. Luke xxiv. 30 be taken, as many take it, of the Eucharist, then we must be prepared to admit that our Lord Himself, whatever may have been the *sacrificial* ritual of the institution, administered it as a *Sacrament* under one kind only. If "the Bible, and the Bible only," were to be our guide

in this matter, then there can be no doubt that we must decide in favour of the Roman use, for we have only one passage of S. Paul to set against a whole array of statement and metaphor on the other side.

But the fact is, it is purely a question of ecclesiastical tradition, and it is through primitive custom, and not through Scripture itself, that we learn what was Christ's mind with regard to this ordinance; and viewed in this light, we have a right to say that "both parts of the Lord's Sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike." For undoubtedly the *rule* of the Primitive Church was to administer in both kinds. That she, however, made very large exceptions to this rule in favour of either kind singly is well known, and is sufficient proof that she attached no idea of sacramental validity to the double reception, and never regarded it as "a mutilation of the Sacrament" to administer in one kind only. She looked upon it wholly as a point of order, and therefore the later Church had a perfect right to change it "according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners" (Art. xxxiv.), just as we ourselves have varied not only from primitive custom, but even from our own post-Reformation laws in the administration of another Sacrament—*viz.* Baptism, in which it is equally true to say that Christ's ordinance, as given us by the Primitive Church, was immersion, and not

affusion. Let us, then, exercise a little charity in this matter, and not judge harshly of another communion where we ourselves are equally open to the same charge of departure from ordained sacramental Ritual.

The fact is, it is a purely practical question, of which different views will always be taken under different conditions of Ecclesiastical and social life. We are too apt to forget that the lawless impiety of the middle ages caused frequent profanations of this Holy Sacrament, and that those feelings of pain and distress which were aroused in ourselves, only a short time since, by the tale of the horrible sacrilege committed with the Sacred Cup in one of our own churches, were, alas ! only too often aroused then. Those days of godless desecration have happily long ago passed away, still there are other practical advantages, which we from our different habits and usage do not appreciate, but which doubtless influence the Roman Church in perpetuating her custom, even though the original scandals that gave rise to it have ceased to be. And one of these is her different practice as to Communion. She prefers to hold the spiritual food in readiness for her children at any moment, and does not confine administration, as we do, to special times and services,—and with such a usage, it is obviously a great practical advantage to be enabled to reserve in one kind only.

Lastly, do not let us suppose that the Church of

Rome attaches a greater importance to this custom than she really does. That she regards it a perfectly open question, is obvious from the fact that she has conceded it, and does still concede it, to national Churches in communion with her, when asked to do so ; and there can be no doubt she would equally concede it in our case, provided always it be not demanded in such a spirit as to imply that double reception was a Sacramental necessity, or that the Bread was the Body, and the Wine the Blood, in any such sense as that recently taught among us.

Just Published. Price 6s.; by Post, 6s. 4d.,

# ESSAYS ON THE RE-UNION OF CHRISTENDOM.

The INTRODUCTORY ESSAY, by the REV. DR. PUSEY,  
Is on Lutheranism, The Scandinavian Bodies, and The Church  
of the United States.

CONTRIBUTORS:—Rev. CANON HUMBLE, The Exigency of Truth; Sir CHARLES L. YOUNG, The Re-union of Christendom in its Relation to Scepticism and Infidelity; Rev. C. A. FOWLER, Present Prospects of Re-union; Rev. G. NUGÉE, A Conference of Theologians, suggested as a further step towards Promoting the Re-union of Christendom; Rev. PERCEVAL WARD, The Difficulties of Re-union; Rev. Dr. F. G. LEE, 1636 and 1866; the AUTHOR of the *Autobiography* in "The Church and the World," Defects and their Remedy in Re-union; Rev. H. M. OXENHAM, Postscript on Catholic Unity; DE Q., The Spirit in which Re-union should be sought; A. L. M. PHILLIPPS DE LISLE, Esq., Corporate Re-union; Rev. T. W. MOSSMAN, Ritualism in its relation to Re-union; and a PRIEST of the Diocese of CONSTANTINOPLE, The True Basis of Re-union.

"A most important and valuable contribution to the literature of Re-union."—*Union Review*.

"It will not be considered any disparagement, we feel sure, by the contributors to this volume, if we say that its chief interest centres in the fact that Dr. Pusey has been induced to supply a Preface to it, which breathing so strong a spirit of faith, will be accepted with great thankfulness."—*Ecclesiastic*.

---

Also, Price 5s.; by Post, 5s. 4d.

## THE SECOND SERIES OF SERMONS ON THE RE-UNION OF CHRISTENDOM.

"Their eloquence, charity, and argumentative ability, are as striking as their object is high and admirable."—*Churchman*.

"They each point to some definite effort, which even individuals may make towards the great end in view. The majority are above the average in ability."—*Ecclesiastic*.

"There is a fine sermon of Mr. Carter's, and another by Mr. Bennett."—*Church Times*.

"As a whole we think them decidedly superior to the first volume which was published. There is no question but that these two volumes are emphatically *the* sermons of the day—that they will occupy a permanent standing-place in Anglican Church literature."—*Church Review*.

---

J. T. HAYES, Lyall Place, Eaton Square, S.W.

Just Published;  
With Introduction by Rev. T. T. Carter, M.A., of Clewer;

DEDICATED, BY PERMISSION, TO  
THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

In 4to., uniform with "SANCTA CLARA on the ARTICLES of  
the ANGLICAN CHURCH" (price 7s., by Post 7s. 5d.),

# Liturgy of the Church of Sarum.

Translated from the Latin, and with an Introduction and  
Explanatory Notes. By CHARLES WALKER, Author of  
the "RITUAL REASON WHY."

"It is thoroughly deserving of careful attention. The Notes and  
Explanations, as was to have been expected, throw a vast amount of  
light on the rules and directions of the Prayer Book."—*Union Review*.

"This, so far as we know, is the first complete version into English  
of the Sarum Liturgy—that is of ORDINARY and CANON of the MASS,  
as it existed and was used in England from the days immediately  
succeeding the Norman Conquest to the eve, or rather the morrow,  
of the Reformation, to the accession, that is, of Edward VI., and  
from the accession to the death of Queen Mary."—*Christian Remem-  
brancer*.

---

Price 7s.; by Post 7s. 5d.

PARAPHRASTICA EXPOSITIO ARTICULORUM CONFESSIONIS ANGLICANÆ.

## THE ARTICLES OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH Paraphrastically Considered and Explained.

By FRANCISCUS A. SANCTA CLARA (Christopher Davenport).

REPRINTED FROM THE EDITION IN LATIN OF 1646.

Edited by the Rev. FREDERICK GEORGE LEE, D.C.L.

"Nothing can be fairer in theological controversy than SANCTA  
CLARA; his Commentary on the 'Articles,' from a Roman Catholic  
point of view, being especially interesting. It is believed that this  
remarkable Treatise formed the basis of Mr. NEWMAN's Tract  
No. 90."—*British Magazine*.

"Our dear friend's [Dr. Newman's] Tract [No. 90] has done good  
and lasting service by breaking off a mass of unauthorised traditional  
glosses which had encrusted over the Thirty-nine Articles. The in-  
terpretation which he then put forth, and which in him was blamed,  
was at the time vindicated by others without blame. The blame was  
occasioned by two circumstances, owing to which Tract 90 was  
thought to admit much more than our friend meant. . . . But  
the principle of Tract 90—viz., that we are not to bring into the  
Articles, out of any popular system, any meanings which are not  
contained in their words, rightly and accurately understood, was not  
and could not be condemned."—*Eirenicon*, by Dr. Pusey, 1865.

---

J. T. HAYES, Lyall Place, Eaton Square, S.W.

WORKS BY THE REV. DR. IRONS

Price 3s. 6d. ; by Post, 3s. 9d.

THE

# BIBLE AND ITS INTERPRETERS.

I. THE POPULAR THEORY ; II. THE ROMAN THEORY ;

III. THE LITERARY THEORY : IV. THE TRUTH.

By W. J. IRONS, D.D., Brompton.

"It is one of those books which are never out of season, which men may at any time discuss, and which will always have a permanent interest and value. It is replete with learning, especially that patristic learning of which probably no one is a greater master than himself. It is full of interest, instruction and consolation."—*Churchman's Family Magazine*.

"Dr. Irons has put forth a valuable paper, containing a good deal of valuable information and not a little valuable thought compressed into a small compass ; and biblical students, whether clerical or lay, will be gainers by the perusal of his pages."—*Church Times*.

"A very remarkable book. We heartily commend it to the attention especially of our clerical brethren, and of all who take an interest in the deep subjects it so ably grapples with."—*Church Review*.

"Dr. Irons propounds what is the true Catholic view, the opinion of the Church in all ages when viewed in the gross, and apart from temporary or occasional aberrations from it."—*Clerical Journal*.

SUITABLE AS A READING-BOOK FOR CHILDREN IN  
PRIVATE FAMILIES OR PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS.

Just Published, Price 1s. ; by Post, 1s. 1d.,

# THE SACRED LIFE OF JESUS CHRIST THE SON OF GOD.

By W. J. IRONS, D.D., Brompton.

"Is a novel undertaking—an attempt by Dr. Irons to give the events of our Lord's life in his (the Editor's) own words, merely just referring to the miracles and parables, which are afterwards tabulated according to their date."—*Ecclesiastic*.

"A most admirable harmony of the Gospel narratives, together with such chronological notes as are needful for their due elucidation. Two tables at the end, "The Miracles placed in order," and "The Parables placed in order," render it a volume of great completeness and considerable practical value. Though brief in length and terse in language, its importance is neither small nor temporary."—*Church News*.

II. THE SACRED WORDS ; and

III. THE SACRED WORKS, are in the Press.

J. T. HAYES, Lyall Place, Eaton Square, S.W.



## TO THEOLOGIAN.

---

Now Ready, 4to. toned paper, 7s. ; by Post, 7s. 5d.,  
A DIGEST OF THE DOCTRINE OF  
**ST. THOMAS ON THE SACRAMENTS.**

By Rev. W. HUMPHREY, Brechin.

"For students of the wonderful *Summa*, as well as for those who have not leisure to devote to its mastery, these volumes must be most acceptable. For the former it is a good common-place book ; to the latter it will give that precision of belief, that incisiveness and nerve which readers of Anglican theology so sadly want. As rigid theology becomes more popular, flaccid, wishy-washy, luxated 'views' will feel themselves nowhere."—*Church Review*.

"This will be found a useful and convenient guide by persons wishing to ascertain the views and the *method* of S. Thomas Aquinas on the subject of Sacramental Theology. The work must have been of some labour and care, as it is well done."—*Literary Churchman*.

"Of course the more material we have for real knowledge of the teaching of the Church at any time, especially of so profound a thinker as the Angelic Doctor, the better. And those who can use St. Thomas's teaching, correcting it by that of better times, and deepening their own thoughts by his, while lifted by God's providence, not by their own powers, above the theological standpoint of his age, will of course find much in this volume that is really valuable. There is, indeed, much in it to rebuke and shame our own superficial ways of thinking, however much there may be on the other hand of over-systemisation, to say nothing of mediæval error."—*Guardian*.

"A treatise of the highest possible value, masterly and lucid in its dogmatic statements and learned expositions of Catholic truth. At the same time it is so full and exhaustive in its mode of treatment that it may be accurately said to contain more in its 200 pages than is often found in volumes of three times the size."—*Union Review*.

"We strongly recommend it to the study of the Clergy. The true doctrines of the Faith are illustrated by S. Thomas with a skill and clearness that cannot be surpassed."—*Ecclesiastic*.

"We know of no book more calculated to correct the crudities and crotchets unfortunately so rife in the matter of the Sacraments and their operation. Every clergyman should get it, and study it diligently."—*Church Times*.

---

LONDON :

J. T. HAYES, Lyall Place, Eaton Square, S.W.







